

The Classical Review

JUNE 1911

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE ANDROMACHE AND THE TRACHINIANS.

In the plays which Sophocles wrote in his splendid old age, his art appears to have undergone a change. His own words reported by Plutarch¹ define his latest style as ἡθικώτατον, most expressive of character, and βέλτιστον, the highest. There can be no doubt *a priori* that, as with all great artists, his work was influenced by the spirit of his time and by his contemporary poets. The effect of the Euripidean manner of writing upon the art of Sophocles has been made clear by various studies of the extant Sophoclean plays. With regard to the *Oedipus Coloneus*, Wilamowitz appears to be right in declaring that 'beyond a doubt Sophocles received the impulse to treat his *Heimatsage* in this play from the Phœnician Women of Euripides.' It has been shown by the late Professor Earle in vol. xxxiii. of the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, that in writing the *Trachinians* Sophocles had the *Medea* before him, and 'that in the case of this play too he paid Euripides the compliment of imitation.' Dieterich² and Wilamowitz³ have also shown the dependence of the *Trachinians* on the *Heracles*, and Professor Earle has pointed out the use of the *Alcestis* by Sophocles in *Trachinians* 325 ff. In my study of the date of *Heracles* I have discussed the

dependence of the *Trachinians* on another play of Euripides—that is, the *Andromache*. In this paper I desire to bring out more fully the likenesses in the structure and motives in these two plays, and to show to what an extent Euripides' interest in and conception of feminine character has affected Sophocles.

The *Trachinians* has been generally recognised as the most Euripidean of the plays of Sophocles. Schlegel, the great Euripides-hater, gives testimony to this unconsciously in expressing the hope that for the sake of Sophocles the play may finally be attributed to some one else. Dieterich and Wilamowitz have made it clear that the character of the tragic *Heracles* has been suggested by Euripides' great play of the years 420-418. That of the heroine *Deianira*, however, does not follow the character of the wife of *Heracles* in that play. Points of likeness between her conduct and that of the deserted *Medea* have been suggested by Professor Earle, but of their natures he says: 'Is not the gentle and patient *Deianira* meant to be a foil to Euripides' fiery-souled *Colchian*?' I think it more probable that the character of the 'most feminine and lovely of the poet's heroines' was suggested by the study of the ideal wife and mother, made by Euripides in the *Andromache* (a play which according to internal evidence was produced in the years 417-416, not long after the *Heracles*), and continued by him in the

¹ Plut. *Profect. Virt.* 17.

² *Rhein. Mus.*, 1892.

³ *Heracles*, I., p. 153.

Troades (415). I hold that the *Trachinians*, a play to which Jebb assigns the limits 420-410, followed by no long interval these two plays of Euripides, one his 'perfect piece'; the other, while distinctly to be reckoned τῶν δευτέρων, as its oldest critic says, yet possessed of a kind of hysterical strength and of the fires of bitterness and of hate.

The resemblances in the general structure of the *Trachinians* and the *Andromache* are striking. In both plays our interest at the outset is centred in the fate of a woman who is lamenting the absence of her protector, in the one case the husband Heracles, in the other Neoptolemus, to whom Andromache has been assigned as prize of war. In both plays the περιπέτεια is occasioned by the conflict between the claims of the lawful wife and those of the δорίκτητος γυνή¹ who in the *Andromache* is the heroine, in the *Trachinians* is utterly silent, and is made real for us only by the pitying words of the wife and of Lichas. In both plays the interest shifts from the fate of the heroine—in the *Andromache* to the death of Neoptolemus and to the fate of the wife Hermione and other characters; in the *Trachinians* to the death of Heracles, and to the fate of the captive Iolê and of Hyllus. Both plays have been criticised for this episodic character. Campbell, followed by Jebb, holds that in the *Trachinians* the two episodes are brought into a strict connection by the love of Heracles for Iolê, which causes him to destroy Oechalia and also causes Deianira to send the robe, and he maintains that in point of dramatic structure the *Trachinians* will bear comparison with the greatest of Sophoclean tragedies. The episodes of the *Andromache* have not found such defenders. The great art of Sophocles has prevailed to obscure to our eyes the inferiority in dramatic interest of the second part of his play, which Jebb with all his admiration for the *Trachinians* admits as a serious defect. In the Euripidean drama there is no corresponding greatness of conception or beauty of execution to hide its defects.

¹ Platt, A., *Sophoclea*, *Classical Quarterly*, July, 1910.

A comparison of the prologues will show that Sophocles has taken not only the motive of the wife left without her protector, but also the language in which she expresses her grief, from the *Andromache*. The Sophoclean play begins with a long Euripidean prologue of forty-eight lines, unique among the existing plays of Sophocles. Deianira tells of her sorrow in verses that correspond to those of the prologue of the *Andromache* in several important points. She begins with a reference to the famous *sententia*: 'Call no man happy before his death,' which appears in the *Andromache* in a more commonplace form at l. 100. She laments her lost happiness in language strikingly similar in sentiment and structure to that of *Andromache*.

Compare

Trach. 5. ἔξοιδ' ἔχουσα δυστυχῇ τε καὶ
βαρὺν πότμον

with

And. 6. νῦν εἰ τις ἄλλη δυστυχεστά-
τη γυνή.

The beginnings of the narratives that follow are the same:

Trach. 6. ἦτις πατρὸς μέν.

And. 8. ἦτις πόσιν μέν.

The story of their unhappy unions and the expression of their fears follow:

Trach. 37. ταρβήσας' ἐγώ.

And. 42. δειματομένη ἐγώ.

Both prologues end with an expression of foreboding because of the continued absence of Heracles and of Neoptolemus respectively. Andromache is filled with fear for the safety of her little son, μὴ θάνῃ φοβουμένη, and Deianira for that of Heracles, σχεδὸν δ' ἐπίσταμαι τι πῆμ' ἔχοντά νιν.

The closing verse of each prologue contains a reference to Heaven—

Trach. 48. θεοῖς ἀρῶμαι πημονῆς ἄτερ
λαβεῖν.

And. 55. θεὸν παράσχουτ' εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν
εὐμενῇ.

The feeling of the two prologues is the same, and after the soliloquy of each unhappy woman a servant addresses her

mistress with sympathy for her grief and a suggestion for the future. Andromache and Deianira accept the words of the slave with a sympathetic reference to the condition of servitude:

And. 64. ὦ φιλότατη σύνδουλε.

Trach. 61. ὦ τέκνον, ὦ παῖ, καὶ ἀγεννή-
των ἄρα
μῦθοι καλῶς πίπτουσιν, ἦδε
γὰρ γυνή
δούλη μὲν, εἶρηκεν δ' ἐλεύ-
θερον λόγον.

The Sophoclean antithesis here is entirely in the manner of Euripides, the poet in whom, as Decharme¹ says, we see for the first time placed together words that would have previously appeared contradictory, *γενναῖος* and *δοῦλος*.

The scenes of the two dramas that follow the first Chorus develop the character of the respective heroines, in each case a presentation of the ideal wife and mother according to the conception of each poet. The character of Deianira is, in Jebb's words, 'by general consent one of the most delicately beautiful creations in literature.' He adds, 'Many who feel this charm will also feel that it can no more be described than the perfume of a flower.' In this subtle beauty the genius of Sophocles is revealed in its greatness, immeasurably surpassing the Euripidean presentation of Andromache. Euripides, alas! did not always with his touches of things common lift them to the spheres. That glory after all belongs also to Sophocles, painting men οἷους δεῖ. Instead of the exquisite loveliness of Deianira Euripides presents to us the sordid spectacle of the young wife, Hermione, and Andromache, the *δορίκτητος γυνή*, contending about woman's virtue, each claiming it for herself and denying it to the other in an ignoble strife. Andromache here and in the *Trojan Women* has the rôle of the ideal wife. In the understanding of her character I am compelled to differ with Professor Gilbert Murray, who has done so much to interpret Euripides to our time. He finds her character in these two plays² wonder-

fully studied. She seems to him to be a woman who has not yet shown much character or perhaps had very intense experience, only waiting for sufficiently great trials to become a heroine or a saint. To me, on the contrary, this character appears that of the conventional type of Athenian wife, which still retained so much of the Oriental in contrast to the freedom of Dorian and of Northern Greece. The well-known passage so often quoted from the oration against Neaira³ need not be repeated here, but it is a direct corollary of such a rule for the conduct of life as that given by Andromache as her own in one of her passages of vituperative advice to Hermione:

χρὴ γὰρ γυναικα, κὰν κακῶ πόσει δοθῇ,
στέργειν ἄμιλλαν τ' οὐκ ἔχει φρονή-
ματος.

'Tis woman's part, though married to a boor,
To please her lord and ne'er dispute his will.'

Andromache has only censure for all women except herself. In this hatred of women she is at one with Hermione, Menelaus, Peleus, and the Chorus, and a marked contrast to Deianira with her humanity and pity for her beautiful young rival. Hermione, too, suddenly forgets that she is Dorian-born and talks in Attic fashion. Andromache praises the woman ἡ ἐνδον μένει; Hermione goes further; 'a man who has a wife, if he be wise, will ne'er let other women come to see the sharer of his home. Let him guard well his doors with bolts and bars, for visits from her women friends without bring naught of good and a long train of evils.' With this may be compared the advice of Paolo,⁴ son of Messer Pace of Certaldo, a Florentine merchant of the fourteenth century, who might be translating from the speeches of Andromache and Hermione. 'Woman is a light thing and vain. If thou hast women in thy house, keep them shut up as much as possible, and return thou very often and keep them in fear and trembling, and take heed that they always have something to do in the house, which they must not neglect.' In

¹ *Euripides and the Spirit of his Drama* (Loeb trans.), p. 117.

² *The Trojan Women*, p. 88.

³ *Katà Neaipas*, 138 C.

⁴ *Men and Manners of Old Florence* (Biagi G.), p. 124.

the Florentine life of the fourteenth century, in which Signor Biagi says the housewife of the time was either a fear-inspiring virago or else a creature wholly absorbed in domestic matters, with no understanding for anything beyond her prayers and her pantry, there is a complete parallel, that has not passed unnoted, to the social condition of women, wedded and *ἐταῖραι*, in Athens of the fifth century, a city in whose history, as Wilamowitz says, no woman had any part except the Jungfrau auf der Burg. Andromache in her various long speeches of self-praise in the *Andromache* and in the *Troades* upholds a single virtue that has made her great among women, that of absolute obedience to Hector and of self-effacement for his sake, carried to an extent which is horrifying from the point of view of Occidental morality. Her bitterness toward women is not surpassed by that of Menelaus, who, one would grant, had some grounds for hatred of womenkind. So I fail to perceive the wonderfully studied character which Professor Murray finds in the Euripidean *Andromache*. We have rather Euripides' conventional picture of the Periclean ideal woman as she is often described in the dramas of this poet. In the scene with Molossus and in that with Astyanax in the *Troades* we have Euripides using the motive of the mother-instinct, which he uses so often with wonderful dramatic effect. But most often in the *Andromache* the heroine merely voices the poet's bitterness against Sparta and against women. Hermione, as a caricature of the Spartan girl, at first serves to express the poet's hatred of Sparta, as giving him opportunity to declaim against the unconventional dress of the Dorian maidens and their education in common with the youths. Even Helen's sin is charged against the Spartan system of female education. Later, however, in her fear that Neoptolemus will take vengeance on her for her attempted murder of his child and of Andromache, Hermione repents, and condemns disobedience in a wife entirely in the Athenian manner. She runs away with her husband's murderer, but quite properly says that she will not marry him unless she can obtain her father's consent. There is no inten-

tional comic touch in the depiction of either Andromache or of Hermione. They are Euripides' pictures of the good and bad women of his time, whom he has depicted *οἷαι ἦσαν*. Even the genius of a Euripides could not make a *Tendenzschrift* like this, intent on lashing his two *bêtes noires*, Sparta and women, into a great artistic play. It remains interesting in many ways, but beyond a question second-rate.

Sophocles, adopting the Euripidean motive of the *ἐρῶσα γυνή*, shows the glory of his genius in this new field. The exquisite refinement of Deianira's nature and her lovely humanity are set forth as nobly as the heroic qualities of the heroines of his earlier and greater plays. He too is depicting the women commended by the Athenian public in his day, the type which Pericles describes—or was it rather Thucydides himself?—as the ideal Athenian wife and mother, whose greatest glory is to be known as little as may be either for good or for ill in the world outside her home. This lesson, which Euripides never tires of repeating, is expressed by him in these two lines of a play written at the time of the Funeral Oration:

γυναικὶ γὰρ σιγῇ τε καὶ τῷ σωφρονεῖν
βέλτιστον, εἰσω θ' ἡσυχον μένειν δόμον.

It was left for Sophocles to make from this pattern a living character fit to be ranked with the women of Shakespeare, and to immortalise the Periclean type. All the insistence of Andromache in the two Euripidean dramas in which she appears, that the perfect woman who minds the ways of her household, *ἡ ἐνδον μένει*, is realised in her and her alone, does not persuade us that she is fine and lovable, nor make us forget for a moment the greatness of Antigone. But the silence of Deianira when she turns from her son's curse is more potent in revealing her greatness than anything that lies within the repertory of Euripides' fluent eloquence. The spiritual beauty of this type of woman, about whose faults and virtues alike Euripides had been didactic for a lifetime, Sophocles has expressed once for all in this play of his later years, with an exquisite art that calls to mind the delicate grace and the nobility of the mourning women

on the Attic grave monuments of the late fifth century. The sorrowful loveliness of Hegeso and her like on these reliefs has for us the same ineffable charm as Sophocles' picture of the Periclean ideal of wife and mother, given in the *Trachinians*.¹

¹ In its verbal style the *Trachinians* displays Euripidean traits. The use of *λέχος* and *λέκτρον* is noted by Fraccaroli. The words *ἀρτίκολλος*, *ἀρτίπους*, *ἀρτίχριστος* form a group of compounds appearing in this play alone of Sophocles' extant plays. Euripides has a liking for this compound; cf. *ἀρτίδακρυς*, *Med.* 903; *ἀρτίμαθής*, *Hec.* 687; *ἀρτίπλουτος*, *Suppl.* 742; *ἀρτίφρων*, *Med.* 294; *I.A.* 877. The compound *καλλιβόας*, *Trach.* 640, seems to be of great significance in view of the fact that Sophocles has but two compounds of *καλλι-*, the other also in a late play (*O.C.* 682), while Euripides has no less than twenty compounds of this word. Moreover, *καλλιβόας αἰλός* is modelled on *καλλιφθογγον κιθάραν* of *Heracles* 356. This characteristically Euripidean compound is also found in *Ion* 169 and *I.T.* 222. The repetitions so frequent in

Sophocles has in this play availed himself of the Euripidean vocabulary, prologue, double plot, and characters. But with all this borrowed material his play is, in the character of Deianira and in the ethical charm of its style so well emphasised by Jebb, worthy of his great genius. He has fallen short of the tragic grandeur of the Mad Heracles in the second part of his play, but in Deianira, 'the perfect type of gentle womanhood' (Jebb), he has given us the most human and lovely heroine of Greek literature, and has surpassed the younger poet, who, with all his interest in the psychology of women, has depicted nothing so great as this, even in his *Alcestis*.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

Vassar College, U.S.A.

Euripides also appear in this play in considerable numbers.

THE BURIAL OF AJAX.

IT were idle to deny that the last scenes of the *Ajax* of Sophocles are a melancholy anticlimax; as such they must strike anyone who reads the play for the first time; as such they must remain to the most devoted of the poet's admirers after long acquaintance. Critics assuming the part of special pleaders have done their best to defend them, but in vain do they talk about the sanctity of burial or the interest the Athenians took in the island of Salamis; Persuasion sits not upon their lips, and the very fact of their apologising shows that they feel there is something wrong. Nor is this feeling confined to the moderns alone; the ancients also experienced it, and honestly allowed the truth. A scholion on 1123 observes that 'such sophisms are not proper to tragedy; wishing to prolong the action after the death of the hero he fell into frigidity, and relaxed the tension of tragic feeling.' This is hardly the judgment of a Byzantine, but rather comes from the great critics of Alexandria. It is notorious that the best judges of antiquity held Sophocles to be an unequal poet, and the contrast between

the overwhelming and terrible effect of the prologue, followed by the splendid poetry and breathless interest of the central scenes on the one hand, and on the other the tame rhetorical ending of the whole play, is the best proof now extant of the truth of their judgment.

It is best on every ground to admit this, and to confess that Sophocles was human after all; though it may also be allowed that on the stage the last scenes are more interesting to a spectator than they appear to a reader. Nor need we say that they are deficient altogether in merit, but nevertheless an anticlimax they remain.

Shall we rather inquire why it was that Sophocles so constructed this drama—what was the purpose that he had before him? To fathom his mind is indeed beyond us all; when Arnold said, 'Others abide our question, thou art free,' he applied to the English tragedian a line which might more truly be applied to the Greek. About Shakespeare's mind and its history we can know a good deal if we like to take the trouble, but Sophocles remains aloof in majesty like a god, inscrutable. Yet

in his art are laws discernible, laws structural and ethical, two of which are concerned with this very question.

To take the structural first, it is remarkable that in five out of the seven plays a more or less subordinate character appears in the earlier and later scenes while absent from the central. In *Philoctetes* Odysseus is the principal actor of the prologue, and returns near the end. In *Electra* Orestes dominates the prologue, but does not appear again until the interest has been concentrated upon his sister. In the *Trachiniae* Hyllus forms the connecting link between the two halves consecrated to Deianira and to Heracles. In *Oedipus Tyrannus* Creon, in *Ajax* Odysseus, again play similar parts.

One effect of this is to frame, as it were, the chief character; the central scenes and their protagonist are thus supported somewhat as the group in the middle of a pediment is supported by the recumbent figures in the side-angles, or again as the main figure is often by the lower ones in the pyramidal composition so familiar to Raffaele. In art which appeals to the eye alone these subordinate persons must be different from one another; in drama this not only is unnecessary, but would indeed be ruinous; hence the chief supporting figure in these plays is the same at either end of it. (Two of the masterpieces of Turgenev, *Fumée* and *Eaux Printanières*, produce by other means a similar effect of framing.) Sophocles, however, is no mechanical workman working to a pattern, and in no two of the five plays is the treatment the same. Orestes is himself in sympathy with Electra, and is even more important than she for the action, though not for the interest, of the play. Odysseus is the enemy of Philoctetes, and is only necessary for the action as the spring which sets the machinery in motion. Hyllus is a connecting link, and perhaps not much more. Creon is most important for the action, as his quarrel with Oedipus leads to the fatal discovery. But in *Ajax* Odysseus is of no importance for the main action, or at any rate of very little, so far as his appearance in the prologue goes; he had indeed been responsible in a way

for the madness of Ajax, but that part of his activity lies 'outside the action.'

Yet just try to imagine what would be the effect of his disappearance from the tragedy. Ajax might have been discovered by Tecmessa and the Chorus sitting amid the slain cattle; all those wondrous passages of pathos, beauty and despair would be the same in themselves; but would there not be something wanting?

Obviously, and that brings in the second or ethical reason. Perhaps we have no right to separate the poet's motives in this abrupt manner; the construction of his plot is as subtle and as defiant of either analysis or imitation as is the lovely language of his verse. But the analyst can only analyse, knowing nothing of the process by which the synthesis was made.

'Great poesy,' said Dryden, 'must be ethical,' and if we give the word a wide enough meaning he spoke truth. Tragedy, anyhow, if it be not ethical, is nothing at all, and the Greeks knew this well enough, Sophocles above all, who could have improved, I fancy, upon Aristotle's treatment of this matter. He knew that not only must the hero have some defect in his character, but also that precisely this must lead to his ruin, if he is to be ruined. And he brings out that defect by contrast. Thus Creon acts as a foil to the vices of Oedipus; throughout the early scenes it is he who is cool and sensible and in the right while Oedipus behaves like a madman, and yet Sophocles takes care, as by some miracle, to keep our sympathies with Oedipus. So is it also with the Odysseus of *Ajax*; he is necessary to architectural completion and at the same time as a foil to the hero; only in this case he serves to enhance both his vices and his virtues. In the prologue he assumes the right attitude of a mortal towards the terrible, omnipotent, inscrutable laws, or powers, or what you please to call them, of this universe, whereof Athena is a type and symbol. γοργώπις, ἀδάματος—yes, those laws are so indeed, and Odysseus knew it. But Ajax first thinks he can defy them, and then rebels when in their remorseless action they have seized him. In his impious pride he tells Athena that he

will do what he likes about Odysseus, and she may have her way in all else. For sake of this hunting (this!) he will reward her, though he may have neglected her aforesaid. Every line he utters, every line she answers, is barbed with that terrible irony which has become proverbial; his blindness and infatuation stand out in the white blaze of a searchlight, as the goddess mocks him and Odysseus gazes in mingled fear and pity upon him. And yet again, as by miracle, it is with Ajax that we sympathise, thinking, like Odysseus, perhaps, not less of ourselves than of him. For Sophocles was far too great an artist to leave any doubt on that; Odysseus is the wise man, Odysseus adopts the correct attitude, but it is to Ajax that the heart goes out.

There is a very interesting parallel to be found in Goethe, the modern who is most like Sophocles in many ways. In *Torquato Tasso* we meet again a similar contrast, the worldly wise Antonio, whose sensible mind enables him to thrive in his environment, who is perfectly right in everything he says, and over against him the unhappy poet who beats himself like a bird against his cage. But Goethe's play is unsatisfactory in its effect because the sympathy of the spectator is not enlisted on the right side. We ought to feel with Tasso, and Goethe has made this impossible. Yet Tasso surely was worth many Antonios, just as the Goethe of *Faust* was worth a wilderness of the Goethe who was minister of Weimar. The poet was so conscious of the defects of the poetic temperament that he turns devil's advocate against his own better and higher self. Sense may rise superior to Sensibility, but Tasso should have been something above both.

Ajax, though no poet himself despite the glorious speeches his creator has put into his mouth, has yet certain defects often associated with the poet, vanity and pride and foolish impetuosity. Pride leads to his ruin, impetuosity consummates it, for Tecmessa knows, and the Chorus also know, that his suicide is mere folly, and had he stayed but an hour longer to think Teucer had been in time to deliver him. Odysseus

may not be entirely amiable, but he marks the contrast to these defects; it were long to dwell upon his words in detail, but the more we consider them the more plainly does this intention force itself upon us. And when the hero is dead and the two blustering generals of the army seek to deny him burial, the very same qualities of Odysseus again shine upon us, now no longer dimmed by the sun of Ajax, but like a gentle moon rising over a night of bewildered confusion. As even the noble Ajax had failed in competition with such a man, and that is just part of the eternal tragedy of life, so the stupid and brutal Agamemnon yields before him like clay in the hands of the potter; like Teucer we feel that we may praise him altogether, for he has deceived our expectation.

Yes, he has deceived our expectation, but why? What right have we to expect anything else? It is not because Odysseus was a bad man, for what evil has he done? nor yet because Sophocles has failed in doing his duty, for when we look at the prologue and consider it coolly we see that it is clear as daylight that Odysseus is neither a bad man nor a fool that he should triumph over the dead. I am almost afraid that it is because we are rather dull ourselves, and have allowed ourselves to be taken in by what Ajax and Tecmessa and the Chorus say, as if they were not prejudiced witnesses.

Such do I conceive to have been the motives which led Sophocles to continue the tragedy as he does. The trouble about the burial is due to the necessity for reintroducing Odysseus and completing the contrast between the two types of character. Presentation of character interested Sophocles more than anything else, and the truly great dramatist is known by this among other signs, that he will rather sacrifice his plot to his characters than his characters to his plot. So in this case the completion of the moral interest brought with it an anticlimax, due to three causes. Firstly, it involved the alterations with Teucer, and Sophocles does not move at his ease in the purview of Billingsgate. Secondly, the burial of a hero never was a matter of

tragic interest to anybody. Thirdly, the cool head, however valuable in life, and however useful as a hero for comedy of the type of Molière and Jane Austen, is a poor subject for tragedy.

Probably a good deal of this has been said before, but in any case it seemed to me to be worth saying now. The more

violent partisans of the poet will, I trust, excuse me; the 'gentle Sophocles' himself certainly would have smiled and said it was no matter,

εἰ πτωχὸς ὦν εἰπὼν τι κάστωμυλάμην.

ARTHUR PLATT.

VERSES IN LIVY.

MR. BRODRIBB does not appear to have observed that the phenomena to which he has called attention (*C.R.* Feb., 1910, p. 10) are by no means confined to the first three books of Livy. In the following list, as in Mr. Brodrigg's, the original text is printed in Roman type and the metrical fragments obtained by rearrangement in italics; in the latter all words which do not occur in the original are marked by Roman type. Where only the original is given, it is already in a metrical form.

Bk. IX. chs. 1-5.

2 § 7. montibus circa perpetuis inter se iuncti.
perpetuis inter se iuncti montibus . . .

§ 13. castra propter aquam uallo circumdant.
propter aquam uallo circumdant castra . . .

§ 15 . . . nec auxilio locus esset.

3 § 8 quamquam filius ipse in primis iam
animum quoque patris consensisse in
adfecto corpore rebatur.
*. . . quamquam filius ipse
in primis . . . animum quoque consensisse
corpore in affecto rebatur . . .*

4 § 9. ut illis decurrere ex Capitolio armatis in
hostem licuit.
armatis illis licuit decurrere in hostem.

§ 10. mortem pro patria praeclaram . . .

5 § 7. caecos in foueam lapsos . . .

§ 10. se solos sine uolnere, sine ferro, sine acie
uictos.
. . . se solos sine uolnere uictos.

Bk. XXI. chs. 10-16.

10 § 5. per quos priore bello rupta foedera sunt
ulti.
. . . per quos ulti sunt foedera rupta.

§ 11. hunc iuuenem tamquam furiam facemque
huius belli odi ac detestor.

*hunc iuuenem tamquam belli furiamque
facemque
odi ac detestor . . .*

§ 13. ipsumque Hannibalem ex foedere
Romanis dedant.

*. . . Romanis ex foedere dedant
Hannibalem . . .*

11 § 6. cum omnia uariis clamoribus streperent.
omnia cum uariis streperent clamoribus . . .

14. nudatam stationibus custodiisque solitis
hostium esse urbem.
. . . nudatam solitis stationibus urbem.

§ 3. totis uiribus adgressus urbem momento
cepit.
*. . . totis adgressus uiribus urbem
momento cepit . . .*

15 § 1. uix ullum discrimem aetatis ira fecerat.
uix ullum aetatis discrimen fecerat ira.

16 § 6. bellum gerendum in Italia ac pro
moenibus Romanis esse.
bellum Romanis pro moenibus esse gerendum.

Bk. XXXIII. chs. 5 10.

6 § 6. nullo inito certamine.

. . . inito certamine nullo.

§ 8. . . ut praegressus corrumpere hosti
frumenta . . .

§ 10. Philippus super amnem Onchestum
posuit castra.

*. . . posuit super amnem castra Philippus
Onchestum.*

7 § 1. nubibus in terram demissis . . .

§ 2. agmen ad incertos clamores . . .

§ 3. relicta ibi statione firma peditum equi-
tumque.

. . . firma peditum statione relicta.

§ 4. Romanus eisdem ad Thetideum castris
cum se tenuisset.

Romanus cum se castris tenuisset eisdem.

§ 8. inops consilii trepidauit.
consilii trepidauit inops . . .

Bk. XLIV. chs. 24-6, 38-42.

24 § 1. condicio rerum poterat: natura inimica.

§ 9. . . . sub ipsis moenibus urbis.

25 § 6. nam modo ne iuuaret bello Romanos
 terra marique, etc.

*nam modo ne bello terraque marique iuuaret
 Romanos . . .*

§ 10. interea Samothracae in templo deposi-
 turum.

26 § 7. et in ripa fluminis Axi posuit castra.

*. . . posuitque in ripa fluminis Axi
 castra . . .*

38 § 3. non grauabor reddere dilatae pugnae
 rationem.

. . . dilatae rationem reddere pugnae.

40 § 7. hora circiter nona iumentum e manibus
 curantium elapsum in ulteriorem ripam
 effugit.

*. . . nona circiter hora
 e manibus curantium elapsum . . .
 . . . ripam iumentum effugit in ulteriorem.*

41 § 6. quae fluctuantem turbarunt primo,
 deinde disiecerunt phalangem.

*. . . primo turbarunt, deinde phalangem
 disicere . . .*

42 § 4. suppliciter uitam orabant . . .

§ 6 retro qui poterant nando repetentes
 terram.

retro qui poterant nando terram repetentes.

Cicero: *ad Att.* I. 1. § § 1, 2.

§ 1. more maiorum negatur.

. . . maiorum more negatur.

ut frontem ferias, sunt qui . . .

qui denegauit et iurauit morbum et illud suum
 regnum iudiciale opposuit. Catilina . . .
 erit competitor.

*. . . morbum iurauit et illud
 iudiciale suum regnum opposuit. Catilina*

or
*iurauit morbum et regnum illud iudiciale
 opposuit. Catilina petet . . .*

§ 2. quoniam uidetur in suffragiis multum posse
 Gallia, cum Romae, etc.

*. . . multum posse uidetur
 Gallia, cum Romae . . .*

With regard to Mr. Brodribb's
 iambs, it must be remembered that
 iambic senarii occur not infrequently
 in historical prose. There are at least
 six in Livy I. 13-25 (e.g. 13 § 8, etiam

regnum duobus regibus fuit), and at
 least thirteen in Velleius Paterculus
 II. 92-118. And nothing is easier
 than to find passages which may be
 rearranged in the metre of Phaedrus.
 In the following iambs verbal changes
 and stopgaps are more numerous than
 in Mr. Brodribb's, and one line has
 been left without caesura, but against
 this may be set off the liberties taken
 by Mr. Brodribb, who in sixteen lines
 has allowed himself a line without
 caesura, a false quantity (uoluptatibus),
 a line ending in two iambic words, an
 anapaest in the sixth foot, and two
 consecutive anapaests. It will be
 observed that the first passage is one of
 those in which Mr. Brodribb detected
 fragments of hexameters.

Livy I. 10 § 6. 'Iuppiter Feretri,' inquit, 'haec
 tibi uictor Romulus rex regia arma fero tem-
 plumque his regionibus, quas modo animo
 metatus sum, dedico sedem opimis spoliis,
 quae regibus ducibusque hostium caesis me
 auctorem sequentes posterius ferent.'

*Iuppiter,
 tibi haec, Feretri, Romulus rex regia
 fero arma uictor, templumque his regionibus
 quas animo sum tacente metatus modo,
 spoliis opimis sedem uoce dedico,
 quae caesis ducibus hostium atque regibus
 auctorem me sequentes posterius ferent.*

Livy XXI. 30 § § 6-8. in ipsis portis hostium
 fatigatos subsistere—quid Alpes aliud esse
 credentes quam montium altitudines? fingerent
 altiores Pyrenaei iugis; nullas profecto terras
 caelum contingere nec inexsuperabiles humano
 generi esse. Alpes quidem habitari, coli, gignere
 atque alere animantes; peruias fauces esse
 exercitibus. eos ipsos, quos cernant, legatos non
 pinnis sublime elatos Alpes transgressos.

*portis in ipsis hostium subsistitis
 fessi: quid Alpibus aliud esse creditis
 quam montium altitudines! uel fingite
 has altiores quam Pyrenaei iugis,
 nullae profecto terrae tanguit sidera,
 nec sunt humano generi inexsuperabiles.
 Alpes quidem coluntur, habitantur, uiros
 gignunt aluntque, fauces praebent peruias
 exercitibus. legati, quos hic cernitis,
 non pinnis eleuati trans Alpes eunt.*

By this time it will be evident that
 metrical 'fragments' may be con-
 structed in equal numbers from almost
 any part of Livy. As one would
 expect, they are much less numerous in
 Caesar's *Gallie War*, where on the
 average one may be found in every
 other chapter, and they are still rarer
 in Cicero's oratorical and philosophical
 prose.

It is obvious that their presence cannot be due to the use of a poetical source, for in the chapters from Bk. XXXIII. he is following Polybius, and no one would seriously maintain that Cicero wrote the first draft of his letter in hexameters. The explanation must lie in some peculiarity of style. Now, the favourite Ciceronian *clausulae* (a cretic or paeon as basis with a trochaic cadence) are as rare in Livy as they are common in Caesar. Further, one may reasonably assume that the rhythm of the whole period is likely to be in harmony with the *clausula*. Hence we need not be surprised to find that Livy begins his history with four feet of a hexameter, and that whereas Cicero and Caesar are full of unmanageable cretics and paeons, Livy's prose contains a fair proportion of words suitable for dactylic verse.

Mr. Brodribb regards the circumstance that the words of his fragments are almost always in prose order as an indication that they were once in metrical form. One would rather take it to be an argument to the contrary.

With respect to his iambics, the following passages furnish a sufficient explanation. Cicero, *Orator*, § 189, *uersus saepe in oratione per imprudentiam dicimus . . . senarios uero et Hipponacteos effugere uix possumus; magnam enim partem ex iambis nostra constat oratio*. Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 9. 4, § 76, *illi (sc. senarii) minus sunt notabiles, quia hoc genus sermoni proximum est. itaque et uersus toti fere excidunt*.

R. L. DUNBABIN.

*University of Tasmania,
Australia.*

NOTES

NOTE ON APPIAN, *BELL. CIV. I.* 21 *fin.*

‘*καὶ γὰρ τις ἥδη νόμος κεκύρωτο, εἰ δῆμαρχος ἐνδέοι ταῖς παραγγελίαις, τὸν δῆμον ἐκ πάντων ἐπιλέγεσθαι.*’

THE above law, on the strength of which Caius Gracchus carried his election to a second tribuneship, has given no little trouble to commentators, who differ considerably in the meaning which they attach to the clause ‘*εἰ δῆμαρχος ἐνδέοι*.’

Mommsen¹ interprets: ‘in case a tribune were to fall short of the necessary qualifications.’ It is questionable whether such an elaborate sense can be loaded on to the single word *ἐνδέοι*. But admitted that the linguistic difficulty might be overcome, Mommsen's explanation does not meet the case. The qualifications for the tribunate were not so complex but Caius' opponents could under all circumstances have put up at least ten candidates against whom no

technical disability could be urged. A second ballot such as gave Caius his chance could thus have been prevented under all circumstances.

Greenidge² offers two alternative suggestions. In the first place, ‘*εἰ δῆμαρχος ἐνδέοι*’ may be an equivalent of ‘*si tribunus non explesset tribus*,’ i.e. had not received a certain number of votes in a certain number of tribes. On this theory it must be supposed that Caius' adherents distributed their votes in such a way as to disqualify all other candidates except a preconcerted ticket of nine. But such a manipulation of the polls would have required a measure of skill among the caucus-mongers and a strictness of discipline in the electorate such as is quite out of keeping with the general disorganisation of the Gracchan party. Furthermore it has been pointed out by Mr. Strachan-Davidson³ that ‘*παραγγελίαις*’ refers not to the polling but to the ‘*professio*’ or preliminary notice of candidature. And

¹ *Römisches Staatsrecht*, I³ p. 473.

² *History of Rome*, p. 165.

³ Note on Appian, *ad loc.*

lastly, can 'ἐνδέοι' *simpliciter* bear such a highly technical meaning as is here given?

Greenidge's second hypothesis is that the law contemplated a numerical shortage of candidates at the 'professio,' and that this deficiency was brought about by the withdrawal of a man of straw at the last moment.

From the linguistic point of view this theory is unexceptionable, but as an explanation of Caius' return it is inadequate. The sudden withdrawal of a Gracchan nominee could readily have been countered by the nobles putting forward a stop-gap creature at the eleventh hour; and if, as seems more likely, the opponents of Caius had entered as many candidates as there were vacancies, the tactics of the Gracchans would have been defeated before they were ever applied.

A new solution of the problem may be attempted by retaining the second of Greenidge's versions while attaching a different explanation to it. The numerical shortage of candidates may have been created by the simple expedient of inducing the tribune who presided at the 'professio' to refuse all nominations after the ninth. The right of returning officers to turn back candidates ('nomen non accipere') at their own discretion is indisputable.¹ Also there need be no doubt that the tribune under whose presidency Caius was re-elected was in collusion with the latter, for all Caius' colleagues in the tribuneship of 123 were amenable to him. Indeed it is not unlikely that the law mentioned by Appian was brought forward in the year of Caius' first tribuneship, the harmless-looking proviso 'ἐὶ δῆμαρχος ἐνδέοι ταῖς παραγγελίαις' being inserted precisely in view of the fact that the returning officer at the tribunician elections for 122 might be depended on to use his right of rejecting candidates *ad infinitum*.

M. O. B. CASPARI.

University College, London.

¹ Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, I³ p. 472. The case of the consul L. Volcatius Tullus, who refused Catiline's 'professio' for the consulship in 66 B.C. (Asconius, § 80), is a good instance of the exercise of this right.

NOTE ON TACITUS, *ANNALS* XIII. 37. 4.

'TUNCQUE (*i.e.* 58 A.D.) primum inlecti *Insochi*, gens ante alias socia Romanis, avia Armeniae incursavit.' In this passage the name *Insochi*, as given in the Medicean MS., has been generally impugned by modern editors, on the ground that there were no such persons as the *Insochi*; and its place has been taken by the reading *Moschi*.²

This emendation is attractive from the palaeographical point of view, and it appears at first sight to suit the context nicely, for the *Moschi*, whose habitat on the upper reaches of the Phasis is copiously attested, were excellently placed for such a raid as Tacitus here describes.

Yet there is reason to believe that the manuscript reading is approximately or even wholly correct. Among the border tribes of Mount Caucasus there existed a people whom Greek writers of various periods mention under the name 'Ἡνίοχοι'.³ Compared with the *Moschi*, these *Ἡνίοχοι* appear to have a better claim to be identified with the Roman allies of 58 A.D. Thus (1) the *Moschi*, lying between the Euxine Sea and the kingdom of Iberia, can hardly have been ignored by the Romans until the reign of Nero, for intercourse with Iberia had been opened by Pompey and renewed under Tiberius, and it is not probable that the intervening land of the *Moschi* was not affected by such communications. Yet Tacitus says distinctly that the Romans had not previously cultivated relations with their allies of 58 A.D. This datum is more applicable to the 'Ἡνίοχοι, who lived on the very slopes of Caucasus, and so beyond Iberia. (2) The forcible way in which Tacitus asseverates the amity of the invaders of Armenia to Rome remains inexplicable so long as the reference is held to be to the *Moschi*, for no ancient author mentions any particular friendship between

² Edd. Baiter-Orelli (1859); Ritter (1863); Haase (1865); Jacob (1877); Nipperdey (1892); Joh. Müller (1903); Furneaux-Fisher (1907).

³ Hellanicus, fr. 109; Scylax, *Periplus*, § 76; Strabo, pp. 495-7; Arrian, *Periplus Ponti Euxini*, § 15; Anonymus, *Periplus Pont. Eux.* § 42.

these people and Rome. On the other hand, Dio Cassius¹ records that Trajan, on the occasion of his expedition into Armenia (*i.e.* shortly before Tacitus composed the later books of the *Annals*), bestowed special rewards upon the king of the 'Hríoχoi.

There remains the question of the Latin equivalent for the name 'Hríoχoi. It is hardly to be supposed that the Greek form is an exact reproduction of the native word. Greek writers were notoriously fond of assimilating foreign names to words of their own tongue (one of the tribes adjacent to the 'Hríoχoi was dubbed 'Αχαιοί); and in the case of the 'Hríoχoi there is a special reason for suspecting that the phonetic transcript is not exact, for etymologists had fathered this people upon the charioteer ('ήνιοχος) of the Dioscuri.² Perhaps a clue to the correct lettering may be found in the name of a robber-folk which at the present day infests the district of Vladikawkas, the *Ingushi*.³ This form suggests that the Latin name of the so-called 'Hríoχoi was *Insochi*, or some closely similar form.⁴ In the one case the Medicean reading is wrong by one or two letters only; in the other it turns out absolutely correct.

M. O. B. CASPARI.

London University.

NOTES ON CATULLUS LXIV.

IN the December, 1909, number of the *Classical Review* (p. 249), Professor D. A. Slater has a note on Catullus lxiv. 241-245, proposing to read in l. 243 *falsi* for *inflati*. He refers to Statius, who, he says, 'twice alludes to the fate of Aegeus in lines apparently derived from these, and who on both occasions applies this same epithet (*falsus*) to the sail.' The passages in question are *Thebaid*, xii. 625, 626,

Sunion, unde vagi casurum in nomina ponti
Cresia decepit falso ratis Aegea velo,

¹ Bk. 68, ch. 19.

² Strabo, p. 496.

³ Lehmann-Haupt, *Armenien einst und jetzt*.

⁴ Pliny (vi. 4. 12) gives the form *Heniochi*. This is probably a mere transliteration of the Greek, and is not based on any direct knowledge of the native form.

and *Silvae*, iii. 3, 179, 180,

haut aliter gemuit per Sunia Theseus
litora qui falsis deceptat Aegea velis.

But surely there is no reference at all to Catullus in either of these passages; the death of Aegeus was a familiar enough story, and as a matter of fact Statius follows a different form of the legend in placing the scene at Sunium instead of on the Acropolis. Notice also in Statius the emphasis added to *falsus* in each case by the collocation of *decipere*, to which there is nothing to correspond in Catullus.

I had always thought that *inflati* could be defended (cp. Merrill's note *ad loc.*, 'The spread of canvas made the vessel the sooner visible to his straining eyes'; so also Ellis); but I am inclined now to follow many editors in accepting *infected* from Muretus, by reason of the reference back to l. 225, in which Aegeus is giving the directions to Theseus:

inde infecta vago suspendam lintea malo.

Then when the catastrophe comes, in l. 243 Catullus, as so often in this poem (cp. my brief article in *Classical Review*, xxii., p. 180), links the two descriptions by repeating emphatic words,

cum primum infecti conspexit lintea veli.

For a similar reason I should be unwilling to accept Professor Tucker's conjecture on Catullus lxiv. 249 in the January, 1910, number of the *Classical Quarterly* (p. 5). He prints

quae † tamen aspectans,

noting that there is a variant

quae tum prospectans,

but proposes to read

quae interea aspectans.

Is not *prospectans* supported here by ll. 52-54, where Ariadne is first introduced?

Namque fluentisono *prospectans* litore Diae
Thesea cedentem celeri cum classe tuetur
indomitos in corde gerens Ariadna furores.

In ll. 249-250, where the poet takes his leave of her, two emphatic words (*prospectans cedentem*) are repeated, *cari-nam* recalls *classe*, and l. 250 gives the

idea of l. 54. The lines then I would read as follows (with many editors),

Quae tum *prospectans cedentem* maesta carinam
multiplices animo volvebat saucia curas.

I would add a note on lxiv. 179,

Discernens ponti truculentum ubi dividit aequor.

In this line *ubi* of the MSS. is omitted by several editors, e.g. Ellis and Palmer, the latter regarding it as dittography. But it is defended by the line from Ennius (twice quoted by Cicero),

Europam Libyamque rapax *ubi dividit* unda.

Here Catullus repeats *ubi dividit* in the same place in the verse, and provides a synonym (*truculentum aequor*) for *rapax unda*.

G. M. HIRST.

Barnard College, Columbia University.

THE CODEx LUSATICUS OF PROPERTIUS.

IN treating of this manuscript, *C.R.* 20 (1906), p. 349, I found fault with Herr P. Koehler for abbreviating its designation, as L, though he was aware that this was already the denotation of Lord Leicester's manuscript at Holkham. But Herr Th. Heukrath in his interesting degree-dissertation *de Propertii codice Lusatico* (Marburg, 1910), a copy of which he has been good enough to send me, points out, pp. 18 sq., that Herr Peper, the discoverer of the Codex, had already (1893) used the same letter. There was no reason in the interests of clearness against his doing so, as my collection of the Holkham MS. had not then appeared; but it is all the same regrettable that Herr Koehler and Herr Heukrath have followed him instead of choosing a different symbol, e.g. A, if the small l which I used distresses them. This would not confuse the denotation of Propertian MSS. by transferring to the Holkham MS. the symbol H, which belongs by ancient right to the Hamburgensis and is used for it by Mr. O. L. Richmond in his recent paper, *Journal of Philology*, vol. 30, p. 165.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Liverpool,
February 27, 1911.

TWO CONJECTURES.

PLINY, *Ep.* ix. 10. 1 :

Cupio praeceptis tuis parere ; sed aprorum tanta penuria est, ut Minervae et Dianae, quas ais pariter colendas, convenire non possit.

The sense here seems to demand that we should read,

ut < et > Minervae et Dianae.

Et could of course easily have fallen out after *ut*.

Livy, xxiii. 16. §§ 11-13 :

Ratus deinde prodita colloquia esse metuque resides factos, partem militum in castra remittit iussos propere apparatus omnem oppugnandae urbis in primam *aciem* afferre, satis fidens, si cunctantibus instaret, tumultum aliquem in urbe plebem moturam. Dum in sua quisque ministeria discursu trepidat ad prima signa succeditque ad muros *acies*, patefacta repente porta Marcellus signa canere clamoremque tolli ac pedites primum, deinde equites, quanto maximo possent impetu in hostem erumpere iubet. Satis terroris tumultusque in *aciem* mediam intulerant, etc.

May not the true reading be *succeditque ad muros aries*? In the preceding sentence we have *apparatus omnem oppugnandae urbis*, and the occurrence of *aciem* just above and just below might account for the alteration of *aries* into *acies*.

G. M. HIRST.

Barnard College, Columbia University.

NOTE ON HORACE, *CARM.* 4. 5. 1.

Divis orte bonis.

The traditional interpretation of these words (denoted below as A) is to take '*divis bonis*' as an Abl. Abs. So Orelli, Müller, Dillenburger, Wickham, Lonsdale and Lee, Gow, and with some reserve Page. An alternative (denoted as B) is to take the Ablative as one of Origin after *orte*. This interpretation the writer ventures to maintain is correct, though no names of note can be quoted in its favour.

In support of the Abl. Abs. can be cited *Sat.* 2. 3. 8 *iratis natus paries dis*, and as a parallel to the sense of A, *Carm.* 4. 2. 37-8, *Quo nihil maius meliusve terris Fata donavere bonique divi*.

In support of B are the following : *Carm.* 1. 12. 50, *orte Saturno*; *Carm.*

3. 6. 33, *Non his iuventus orta parentibus*; *Carm.* 4. 6. 32, *puerique claris Patribus orti*; *Epist.* 1. 6. 22, *quod sit peioribus ortus*; *Sat.* 1. 6. 73, *pueri magnis e centurionibus orti*; also such cognate passages as *Maecenas atavis edite regibus* or the Virgilian *nate dea*.

But the most weighty argument against A is that it leaves *orte* standing blankly alone, which would seem to be very questionable latinity. The nearest parallel in Horace is apparently *Epist.* 2. 1. 17, *Nil oriturum alias, nil ortum tale fatentes*, but surely every scholar must feel that there is a wide gap between

such a construction and the bald address of Augustus as *orte*.

To sum up: A presents us with a form of address which is in itself doubtful Latin, and which certainly has no parallel in Horace, nor to the best of the writer's belief in any author of repute; in B we have a common construction with five or six exact parallels in Horace, and which yields an excellent sense.

Surely, in spite of weighty names, A kicks the beam.

A. SLOMAN.

The Vicarage, Godmanchester, Huntingdon.

REVIEWS

RECENT MONOGRAPHS ON GREEK AND LATIN METRE.¹

THE study of Greek and Latin Metre appears at present to be in the stage in which Etymology lay before the invention of *Sprachvergleichung*; that is to say, we have abundance of material, considerable activity in research, and an entire absence of historical method. It may be said generally that writers on metre start from the assumption that all Greek and Latin verse is constructed upon abstract principles which hold good for all time; and recently there has been an increasing tendency to accept the principle of accent, which upon the known facts is a factor in classical metres only in a comparatively late stage, as the most fundamental. Before accepting a starting-point which lacks not only proof but probability, it seems better to endeavour to treat our

material in accordance with ascertained facts.

The metres actually known to us in the classical languages appear to be based upon the following principles, which are stated in their presumed historical order:

(i.) Syllabic verse with caesura. Here the number of syllables is alone considered. Such is the metre of the Avestic hymns.

(ii.) Syllabic verse with caesura and quantitative preference. Here the number of syllables remain fixed, but preference is shown for long and short syllables respectively in particular positions. This is the metre of the Rigveda, and largely that of Greek and Latin lyric poetry.

(iii.) The same with a limited use of the principle that a long syllable may be replaced by two short syllables. The Greek hexameter, and the Iambic and Trochaic metres of Greek tragedy and comedy represent this stage. Verses of this type are usually readily divisible into feet.

(iv.) The same with preference for accented syllables in certain positions. This tendency is perceivable in all Latin metres.

(v.) Purely accentual verse, found in late Latin only.

In treating of any individual metre

¹ (1) *Enoplic Metre in Greek Comedy*. By J. Williams White. University of Chicago, 1907. (2) *Horace's Alcaic Strophe*. By L. J. Richardson. University of California, 1907. (3) *Zwei Beiträge zur lateinischen Metrik*. Von Julius Cornu. Prag, 1908. (4) *Beiträge zur lateinischen Metrik*. Von Julius Cornu. Wien, 1908. (5) *Carmen Arvale seu Martis Verber, or the Tonic Laws of Latin Speech and Rhythm*. By T. Fitzhugh. University of Virginia, 1908. (6) *The Twenty-Second Book of the Iliad*. With critical notes, by Alex. Pallis. London (D. Nutt), 1909. (7) *The Law of Breves Breviantes in the Light of Phonetics*. By E. A. Sonnenschein. University of Chicago, 1911.

found in Greek or Latin, the right method seems to be to endeavour to find it a place in the above scheme more or less corresponding to its date. But it remains to be added that most theories of metre are capable of scientific verification, if the material is sufficiently abundant; for syllables can be counted, and the proportion of long and short syllables, or of accented and unaccented syllables, can be stated in the form of a fraction. Statistics are as essential to metrical theory as to an investigation in physics; it is, however, very seldom that they are forthcoming. Further, no metrical theory is satisfactory which will enable prose to be treated as verse. This, as is fairly well known, is a result which more than one speculative theory has reached.

The Homeric hexameter occupies so dominant a place in the history of metre that it is a convenient starting-point for every discussion. The syllabic principle holds good for the fall¹ of the sixth foot, which is *syllaba anceps*, as in the Avesta every syllable is. In the first five feet a long syllable in the fall is equivalent to two short syllables; here we have quantitative equivalence. But according to the accepted rules the first syllable of each foot is invariably long. According to the history of metre we should expect to find that this rigidity represents what in an earlier stage was only a preference. Therefore when Mr. Pallis writes: 'In the present edition I adopt without reserve the principle that in the Homeric epics every tribrach can count as a dactyl and every iambus as a spondee,' he is only stating what is historically probable. On the other hand when Fick states that 'all short syllables can be lengthened as the effect of the ictus,' and Mr. Pallis that 'these short syllables must certainly have introduced a wrong pronunciation into the words in which they occurred,' they both seem to fall into the common linguistic error of assuming that rules exist before exceptions. For the facts as regards Homer Mr. Pallis supplies a solid basis which is worthy of attention; for though he introduces

very numerous alterations into the received text, the object is in all cases to remove forms which are found only in the rise of the foot, and which thus proclaim themselves due to too rigid metrical theory.

The iambic metres of tragedy and comedy represent an earlier stage of metrical development. Thus in the trimeter (for instance) the syllabic base of twelve syllables is still commonly observed, whilst of each pair the first syllable is only preferably short, and the latter, though regularly long, is only occasionally replaced by two short syllables as a quantitative equivalent. Into the scheme of these metres, Prof. Sonnenschein, as I understand him, proposes to introduce the bacchiac (~ - -) and the cretic (- ~ -) and thus to avoid the necessity of postulating certain shortenings which involve phonetic difficulties. His words are:

'I see no *a priori* impossibility in the rise or fall of a foot being formed of two syllables of which the first is short, but the second long.'

The theory of Prof. Sonnenschein (I speak with all reserve of so eminent a Plautine scholar) is to my mind untenable. Against it stand first the solid facts that Plautus is familiar with both the bacchiac and the cretic foot, but in metres totally unlike those which are based on the iambus or trochee; and secondly that whilst we account for tribrach, anapaest, or dactyl as equivalents of iambus or spondee in accordance with known historical principles, the introduction of the new feet involves the appearance of a principle hitherto unrecognised. The matter cannot be disposed of in a few lines of comment, but when Prof. Sonnenschein tells us in connexion with iambic verse that 'to my ear [*Rudens* 459] is more rhythmical than [verses 458 and 460],' I cannot help thinking that he may unconsciously be measuring ancient Latin semi-quantitative verse by the standards of modern English accentual verse. The phonetic difficulty of counting as short the italicised syllables in words like *voluptatem*, *apstulisti*, *exprobras*, *insidiae*, is undoubtedly serious; but it is going too far to suggest that the pronunciation of these words by Plautus and his hearers

¹ I adopt the convenient term suggested by Prof. Sonnenschein to indicate that part of the foot which does not bear the metrical ictus.

can in any way be determined by that of Cicero.

Dr. Cornu takes as the motto of one of his essays 'accentus anima versus,' and describes a foot of the type $\sim \sim$ as 'no genuine dactyl,' thus raising the fear that he too is bent on basing the Latin hexameter on the accent. He is however on safe ground when he maintains that 'there are things in Latin verse-formation which the quantitative theory alone cannot explain.' Why, for instance, are such forms as *colligere* (with elided final) and *armâque* so rare in the fifth foot of the dactylic hexameter, if not because Latin metre requires that in the fifth and sixth feet the accent should coincide with the ictus? We could wish that Dr. Cornu had pursued this question methodically. It is of course clear that in the second foot it is rare for accent and ictus to coincide, and it is stated that in the fourth foot the ictus-bearing syllable is usually unaccented. Putting these facts together, the conclusion seems clear that accent was originally entirely disconnected from ictus, and that so far as it plays a part in Latin metre it represents a new and ultimately an irreconcilable force. But though Dr. Cornu does not deal with any such generalisations, he supplies many interesting details, and we look forward with expectation to the time when he will combine his various investigations in a single systematic work. In his paper on the *distinctio* of the Roman poets he proposes to alter the received punctuation of many well-known passages, and this with much success.

Mr. Richardson, in the publications of the University of California, attempts to analyse Horace's Alcaic strophe into feet. Starting from the principle that two successive words cannot commonly correspond to two successive feet, he is led to the conclusion that the eleven-syllable verses are to be divided into $4 + 4 + 3$:

o matre pul | chra filia | pulchrior,

the first foot being in character a di-iamb. The precariousness of reasoning on this point is well known, and we cannot but notice that the historical theory of metre does not at all require

that all verses should be divisible into feet.

Prof. J. W. White deals with those metres in Greek comedy which are now commonly called dactylo-epitritic or Doric, but which (in his view) are better termed enoplic. He compares the few verses of this type in Aristophanes with similar verses in the tragic poets and in Pindar, and finds that they are always based on metrical elements consisting of four syllables with varied quantitative succession, and not upon the dactyl. He is careful to explain that he is not dealing with origins. Nevertheless, it deserves to be pointed out that the enoplic theory is not only in accord with the classical tradition (on which point reference may be made to the lucid article of the late Prof. Fr. Blass 'on the rhythms of Bacchylides' in *Hermathena* XXX.), but also agrees better with the general theory of metre than the supposed combination of the trisyllabic dactyl with the quadrisyllabic epitrite.

Prof. T. Fitzhugh deals boldly with the general subject of the 'history of Italico-Romanic rhythm,' and publishes *Prolegomena* and *Supplement to Prolegomena*. His position is that Italian verse was originally ictuo-accentual, and that Ennius was the first to superpose considerations of quantity. This theory of course isolates Italian metre from that of other Aryan nations possessing an early verse-literature, and is based partly on *a priori* considerations, partly on an analysis of the Saturnian metre and of the *Carmen Arvale*. On account of the scarcity of the remains it is particularly easy to read any theory into these metres; but it is demonstrable that the Saturnian contains a quantitative element, and Prof. Fitzhugh has, to say the least, overshot the mark.

The comparison of these papers can only confirm the conviction that the study of metre is still, as regards its fundamental principles, in the pre-scientific stage. In one point only do we stand clearly on higher ground than our grandfathers: they thought that quantity was all; we know that it is not all.

EDWARD V. ARNOLD.

Bangor.

HANDBUCH DER GRIECHISCHEN DIALEKTE.

Handbuch der Griechischen Dialekte, von ALBERT THUMB. (In Hirt and Streitberg's *Sammlung indogermanischer Lehr- und Handbücher*.) Pp. xviii, 403. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1909.

PROF. THUMB dedicates his book to his master Karl Brugmann, whose monumental *Griechische Grammatik* he is himself now preparing for its fourth edition. He is the greatest authority living on the whole range of the history of Greek: we need only mention by the side of the present volume his pioneer work on *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, soon to reappear with the results of ten years' work added, and the much enlarged new edition of his *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache*. English translations of both these works have been arranged for by Messrs. T. and T. Clark; and it is to be hoped that English Hellenists will learn from them to realise how much is lost for the appreciation of Greek by the irrational isolation of the language in its relatively brief period of literary brilliance. In this book on the ancient Greek Dialects Prof. Thumb is of course mostly working as far away from the field of the classical scholar as when he expounds the world-language of the Roman Empire, or the patois of the peasants of to-day. But the solidarity of all Greek studies is being slowly recognised, and when our Atticists have learnt this lesson we may expect a veritable renaissance in the much-threatened study of the noblest of human tongues. The part of Dr. Thumb's work which classical scholars will need most is of course his exposition of the dialect elements in literature. The mixed and artificial character of Greek literary language makes the guidance of a trained philologist peculiarly necessary when specialists in other fields tackle historical or archaeological or literary problems in which language is involved. Dr. Thumb provides a useful illustration in the acute discussion (pp. 363f.) of the date of the Attic *ā* 'pure' in its development from the Ionic-Attic *η*. It will appear that more than a century

before the beginnings of Attic Tragedy forms like *Ἀθάνα* were as un-Attic as they were in Plato's time, and that Attic had already diverged from both Ionic and the other Greek dialects in the treatment of the primitive *ā*.¹ A still more burning question comes up in his delineation of the Homeric dialect. Hesets forth the Aeolic traits in Homer's language, puts aside the dilettante philologists' suggestions that these may be Ionic archaisms, and at the same time rejects Fick's doctrine of an Aeolic 'Ur-Homer' as 'zu äusserlich.' Epic dialect arose in an Aeolic centre like Smyrna, which was early contaminated with Ionic speech-mixture. Since a literary dialect, appropriated to the epos, grew out of these mixed conditions, the appearance of Aeolic forms is no warrant of early date, nor does that of Ionic forms prove lateness, although more Aeolic forms are likely to appear in early epic than in late.

In the case of a book by so acknowledged a master, the value of which lies in its full and systematic presenta-

¹ Prof. Ridgeway's note in his fascinating *Origin of Tragedy*, p. 3, attempts to show that in *χῶρη*, etc., Ionic has developed a tendency which in Attic received a more limited application. This is, of course, quite arguable, though no philologist would say that 'Attic went the whole way with Ionic and then turned back.' The Ionic-Attic vowel answering to original *ā* was a very broad *ē*, much broader than the *η* which came from original *ē*, just as that again was broader than *ē(ei)*. This *ē* remained distinct from *η* in Attic when 'pure,' while in Ionic (as in Attic when 'impure') it became identical with *η*. This is all set forth with convincing lucidity in the passages of Brugmann's *Grundriss* to which Prof. Ridgeway refers. That forms of the *Ἀθάνα* type could ever have been Attic except as borrowed words is an assumption that would throw all scientific dialectology into disorder. It may be observed that Dr. Ridgeway's objection to Brugmann's use of *ἰφάναι* is easily turned by substituting *κερδάναι* or *καθάραι*, which can even be quoted from fourth-century Attic: these forms—obvious analogy levellings—are normal in the *Κοινή*. By the way, does not Prof. Ridgeway himself explain the tragic *ā* (it may be Doric, Boeotian, Aeolic, or anything but Ionic-Attic), when he shows the prominence of Sicyon in the early development of Tragedy? But there I am venturing on his preserve, and I must be careful.

tion of detailed material, it is needless to attempt any elaborate description, or to examine points in which there might be differences of opinion. As far as we can judge, after using the book for teaching purposes, it could hardly be improved, unless possibly we might ask

for a yet fuller Greek Index, containing every occurrence of a dialectic word, with an abbreviation after it to show under which dialect it comes. The opportunity of this extension ought to arrive soon.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

DIE ILIAS UND IHRE QUELLEN.

Die Ilias und ihre Quellen. Von DIETRICH MÜLDER. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910.

THIS is a strange book, about which it is easier to hold an opinion than to express it. Still, if the propositions ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν γνῶσεσθε αὐτοὺς and *librum si malus est nequeo laudare* are arranged syllogistically, the conclusion must be unfavourable. The fruits of this book—that is, the writer's theory of the *Iliad*—are as follows. About the last quarter of the seventh century Homer, an individual, composed, probably in Ionia, our actual *Iliad*, which is an organic whole. He composed it mainly out of already existing poetical literature, with additions of his own and free treatment of his sources. He drew chiefly from two poems, one on the Theban War, another containing the exploits of the Thessalian peoples under the leadership of Achilles in the district of Adramyttium. Impelled by an 'universaler stoffordnender Idee,' Homer (A) generalised the canton-warfare of the Seven against Thebes into a national enterprise; (B) sent the host over the water against an alien race after the precedent of the Thessalian poem. One detail was still wanting—the name of the place or people against whom the generalised Argives fought: this was found in a third poem which described the relations of Hercules with Laomedon, king of Ilios. The *Iliad* was made. The reader will observe that not only did Homer about 625 B.C. compose his poem, but he by the same act invented the Trojan War—an event which had no real existence and had never been heard of before. The *Odyssey* was composed by another individual, after the

model of the *Iliad*, in the time of Pisistratus.

Such a theory it is neither possible nor necessary to criticise formally. The method is only the old Kirchhoffian method of the discovery of discrepancies and inconsistencies, and the inference from them to the circumstances of composition of the poem. These discrepancies thirty years' experience has shown to be illusory, and the circumstances of composition which were imagined to result from them are given the lie by every new addition to the facts of language and ethnology. Herr Mülder's method, I say, is the same as that of the school of Kirchhoff; but whereas Kirchhoff and his followers use their method to detect the diastem, harmoniser, or anachronist, Herr Mülder, with nothing less than second sight, describes in the same places the poet at work upon his sources—sources which Herr Mülder has invented *ad hoc*. The book is indeed a hard nut for evolutionists to crack, seeing that arguments essentially the same as theirs and which in their hands prove four centuries of development reduce, in Herr Mülder's laboratory, the same corpus vile to entirely different dust.

I do not argue with the writer, but I will suggest to my reader some consequences of this theory. When Homer composed the *Iliad* and invented the Trojan War in 625 B.C., it was a hundred years, according to Peripatetic and local chronology, since a series of poems had been begun which covered the Tale of Troy exactly to the beginning of our extant *Iliad*, took it up again at the last line of our *Iliad*, and continued it to the beginning of our *Odyssey*; the same period since Cynaethus had

composed the hymn to Apollo and recited Homer in Syracuse for the first time after its foundation. Early in the seventh century Magnes, at the court of Gyges, sang the wars of the Lydians and the Amazons, Aristaeas sang his own adventures, Terpander and Tyrtaeus swept their lyres, Arion toured in Sicily, Callinus ascribed the *Thebais* to Homer, and Alcman told how Circe anointed the men of much-enduring Ulysses. Silently, unknown to tradition, at the end of this century, when epos was all but thrust from the scene, at the very moment when the humble Eugammon was winding up the family history of Ulysses in his *Telegonia*, and Stesichorus was refreshing the epic themes with new measures, this prodigious birth, the greatest achievement of the Greek spirit, came to the light. Its effect was miraculous; within a generation after the *Iliad* was pieced together in Ionia, Clisthenes of Sicyon was expelling Homeric rhapsodes from his town, and in three generations the Athenians based a claim to Sigeum upon their place in the Homeric Catalogue, a document of international authority.

I do not expect any of these considerations to weigh with the writer, but I invite the reader to consider how lightly, at the bidding of what the history of the Homeric Question has shown to be non-existent criteria, the course of Greek history and even the development of the Greek mind are sacrificed. Two questions must occur to any but a frivolous critic: (1) How could the Greek national poem, Bible, Libro d'oro, and Domesday Book, be born a generation before Solon, all unknown to the world, and in a century bustling and ringing with professional life and active professional rivalry?¹ If the fact were true, how

could it have been forgotten? Where did Herodotus find the materials for his estimate of 400 years? How did the Parian marble arrive at 900-910? (2) How within a century could the Homeric theology have moved Xenophanes to his protest? and how could the Spartan before Gelo have appealed, as to an international feat, to a literary fabrication 150 years old? It is passing the bounds of decent speculation to suppose the good faith of any nation could be so quickly and so completely surprised, much more so that of the Greeks, who were born genealogists, retained a lively recollection of how the Dorians descended from Pindus, and how this and that family came of Cadmus, or Neleus, or the Lapiths.

The writer purposely puts archaeological and linguistic evidence on one side; he calls them *Materialismus*. His observations in detail have often a kind of bewildered acuteness, but his general principles prevent them arriving at any possible conclusion. They have the pathetic interest of the American who is at present engaged in the bed of the river Wye. He often lands an attack well on the Separatist target, and in one thing it must be said he seems on the right track: the *Iliad* is to him the work of an individual, its characteristics are the result of individual talents and failings. It is a long time since this obvious truth has been stated in Germany.

Many strange things have been written about Homer, from Wolf to Kirchhoff inclusive; and Kirchhoff's living disciples have worthily carried on the torch. It may be hoped that in this book we have touched bottom, and that, for all the credulity and elvishness of our English Homerists, the daily increasing output of archaeological and linguistic evidence may at length bring judgment and truth back to these studies.

T. W. ALLEN.

¹ Theopompus, it is true, put Homer at the same date, ol. 43; but if Clement and Tatian report him correctly, he must have based an inference on some anachronism in a Cyclic poem which went currently as Homer's. The older critics were dead to language, if Aristotle

gives the *Margites* as Homeric. Even Theopompus, however, did not bring the Trojan War down to this period.

HANNIBAL'S MARCH.

Hannibal's March. By SPENSER WILKINSON. Clarendon Press.

THE data for a conclusion about Hannibal's Pass still provide a healthy exercise for intellectual athletes, and will probably continue to do so till such time as scholars shall agree about the date and personality of Homer. Professor Wilkinson has now entered the lists; and perhaps it is not altogether superfluous for a reviewer of his monograph to recapitulate in the briefest way what we are told by ancient authorities. According to Polybius, Hannibal crossed the Rhone at a point distant by four days' march from the sea; marched in four days to the 'Island' or delta formed near or in the country of the Allobroges by the confluence of the Rhone and the 'Skaras'—which has been usually identified with the Isère,—thence advanced ten days up 'the river,' which brought him to the actual passage of the Alpine chain. In crossing, he passed close to a 'white rock,' and showed his army a view of Italy from the summit of the pass. Livy follows Polybius here and there, but introduces details which are inconsistent with the earlier narrative. According to Livy, Hannibal marched up the Rhone, after crossing it, to the Insula and the neighbourhood of the Allobroges; then, leaving it, turned 'to the left' into the country of the Tricastini and Tricorii and Vocontii—that is, a district considerably south of the Isère; thence to the Durance, which he crossed, and continued by a *campestre iter* to the Alps. Both historians describe encounters between the Carthaginian army and the hill tribes through whose country it passed. They do not agree in their account of the part of Italy into which the army descended. Livy says it was the country of the Taurini, Polybius that of the Insubres. Varro is another 'authority.' He enumerates five Alpine passes known to the Romans of his day, and tells us that Hannibal crossed by the second of these, counting from the Mediterranean northwards.

On the statements of Polybius, it would be easiest to suppose that Hannibal crossed the Little St. Bernard; and till the early eighties that view was generally accepted. It was approved by Arnold and by Mommsen. But clearly there was always much to be said in favour of a more southern pass, not involving a long circuit like the Little St. Bernard route—unless, indeed, we are to press the statement of Livy and Polybius that Hannibal went north so as to escape Scipio. Mr. Freshfield pleads for the Col de Larche, otherwise called Col d'Argentière. The Carthaginians marched up the Rhone to the Rhone and Isère confluence, or thereabouts, and then turned abruptly eastward and crossed a hilly country to the upper waters of the Durance, whence to the Col de Larche. What, then, becomes of Polybius' ten days' march up the river after the Island? Mr. Coolidge votes for the Mont Genève, near the Mont Cenis route, but allows, or allowed, that there is much to be said for the Little St. Bernard (see *The Alps in Nature and History*). Now comes Professor Wilkinson with a different route altogether. He is not the first to suggest it; his book is a detailed justification of the view held by two French officers, Colonel Perrin and Captain Colin. According to these two gentlemen and Professor Wilkinson, the Rhone was crossed at the head of its delta, just above Fourques, only about thirty miles from the coast. Thence the Carthaginians marched in four days to the Island, which is the delta formed by the confluence of the Rhone and the Sorgue; in ten more days, to a place on the Isère, near St. Nazaire, about twenty miles above the confluence of that river and the Rhone; thence eastwards 'by Montaud, Noyarey, Grenoble, the valley of the Arc, and the Col du Clapier to Susa and Avigliana,' which route is 'both the shortest route through the Alps from France to Italy and the route which offers the fewest and least formidable defiles.' It is further urged in defence of the Col du

Clapier—and on these points, indeed, Colonel Perrin and Professor Wilkinson lay most stress—firstly, that this route leads directly past a very prominent, light-coloured mass of rock, easily to be identified with Polybius's *λευκόπετρον ὄχυρόν*; secondly, that the Col du Clapier alone of possible Alpine passes commands a view of sub-Alpine Italy; thirdly, that the difficulties of the descent as described by Polybius and Livy are such as would confront an army descending by this particular pass. Apart from this evidence, how far does Professor Wilkinson accord with ancient authority, and with what, in view of the uncertainty of the latter, is really almost as important, *a priori* probability? Certainly he is to be commended for a most meritorious attempt to make the most of Polybius and Livy. He may 'interpret' them; he does not disregard them. The base of the theory is that Hannibal did not cross the Little St. Bernard. He left the Isère pretty low down. Then, in order to fit in Polybius' fourteen days' riparian march, he must have crossed the Rhone low down, too. So he crossed it at Fourques. But can thirty miles from the coast correspond to Polybius' four days' going? Yes, says Professor Wilkinson; Polybius says 'four days' because Scipio, marching to catch Hannibal, took four days from the sea to the Carthaginian crossing-place. We do not know that; all that seems clear is that Scipio did not take more; but according to the narrative he may have taken less. Scipio was in a hurry, probably. Be this as it may, Hannibal marched in a leisurely four days to the 'Insula' formed by the confluence of the Sorgue with the Rhone; so that Polybius and Livy, who say that this was the Allobroges' country, must be mistaken; there are no Allobroges so far south. Ten days more, and Hannibal is twenty miles up the Isère valley. Having got so far, one would expect him to continue in that valley to its head, and cross the Little St. Bernard; but no, he turns due east, strikes the Arc valley, and heads for the Col du Clapier, a pass which apparently was not very commonly used. Meantime, what becomes of Livy and the passage

through the country of the Tricastini and Vocontii, and the crossing of the Durance? Professor Wilkinson does his best to utilise Livy; but he can only do so by assuming that that historian confuses the order of events, and that the Carthaginians crossed the Durance in their march up the Rhone at the confluence of the two rivers—not, as Livy says, after marching through the above-mentioned country. It is worth noticing, however, that in Livy's description the army seem to have crossed the Durance by wading. Could that be done near its junction with the Rhone? Really, one cannot reconcile Polybius and Livy. Our author follows the excellent principle of neglecting no authority; and this must be counted to him for righteousness; but he is essaying a hopeless *tour de force*.

When we come to the actual passage of the Alps, the evidence on which Professor Wilkinson mainly relies cannot be said to be really conclusive for the Col du Clapier—it contradicts nothing and it confirms nothing. Hannibal *may* have marched from the Isère by the route which the Professor and the French officers have so carefully and ingeniously traced for him. But the ancient historians really supply nothing that can be called evidence. There is a mass of 'white' rock—the Rocher de la Porte—on the way to the Col du Clapier.¹ But how many cliffs are there on the passes of the Graian and Cottian Alps which might be called *λευκόπετρον ὄχυρόν*? As to the view of the Italian plain which the Clapier—one of possible passes is said to possess, there is no pass with a descent into Italy where a general might not say to his troops, 'That valley brings you to Italy.' To turn this simple and obvious sentence into 'there is Italy' is surely not inconsistent with the sobriety of even a Polybius—let alone a rhetorician like Livy. Nor can we well lay stress on the difficulties of the descent as pointing to the Col du Clapier more than any other Col. The difficulties described by Polybius and

¹ This white rock, I am told by Mr. Coolidge, is also on the route to the Petit Mont Cenis.

Livy read like the ordinary incidents of travel—slight impediments to a pedestrian, but real obstacles to an army, impressive (as steep snow always is) to the inexperienced, and no doubt losing nothing in the narrative. What does it all amount to? The army tried to cross a slope of hard old snow, coated over by a fresh fall—not enough of the latter to hold the foot. So men and beasts slithered and slid, as Polybius says, in a quite natural and familiar way, or else crushed through the lower crust and stuck in it: they would be particularly likely to do this with spring snow, which is peculiarly holding. There is a little glacier below the Col du Clapier, and Professor Wilkinson says that this was what Hannibal

tried to cross. But I submit that what Polybius and Livy describe is not in the least like the passage of a glacier near its snout. And, in fact, such a passage, not always altogether without difficulty for walkers, must generally be out of the question for an army.

On the whole, while Professor Wilkinson's theory is interesting, and his defence of it is highly ingenious, I cannot see that we are much nearer truth. There is nothing in Livy or Polybius which really tells for the Col du Clapier. And *a priori* the pass is improbable. It seems never to have been a much used route, and the highroads of later times certainly followed different lines.

A. D. GODLEY.

ALLEN'S ERASMI EPISTOLAE, VOL. II.

Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami denuo recognitum et auctum per P. S. Allen, M.A., Collegii Mertonensis Socium. Tom. II. Oxonii in Typographeo Clarendoniano. MCMX. Pp. xx+608. 18s. net.

THE three years from August 1514 to June 1517 which this volume covers are full of interest to every student of Erasmus' life and work, and not least to the English student. They were spent chiefly in Belgium and at Basle, but they also saw visits to London and Rochester. Among his English correspondents during this period of maturity, when he would be approaching and passing his fiftieth year, were Fisher, Warham, Colet, More, Bullock, Linacre, Latimer. The letters from these correspondents outnumber in the aggregate those from him to them: indeed, in the volume as a whole, for every two letters of Erasmus (his epistolary Prefaces included) there will be found to be some three from other people. The letters from his English friends are worth having. They throw a pleasant light on the shrewd intelligence of the senders, who judged to a nicety what Erasmus was best fitted to do and were very ready to help and stimulate him. And incidentally they

illustrate their own characters and work. For instance, a good sketch of More and his *Nusquama* (the *Utopia*) might easily be drawn from passages on pages 193, 339, 442, and 459 of this collection. As for Erasmus himself, the well-known letter to Lambertus Grunnius (pp. 291-312), whatever its exact biographical value, graphically describes feelings and hardships which in the main the young scholar had certainly experienced.

Letters passing between Erasmus and Budaëus, together with one from Tunstall to Budaëus, and another from Budaëus to Tunstall, fill some eighty pages of the present volume. More than one of Budaëus' letters is long enough to deserve the title which Erasmus once gave to the last he had received—an *Epistle of Budé*. Erasmus replies in kind; and the result, on both sides, is much elaborate writing, many literary compliments, and some instances of doubtful Greek. But though they have many tastes in common, Erasmus and Budaëus are strongly contrasted personalities. The Low German is pre-eminently a humanist, the Frenchman pre-eminently a scholar of the scientific type. The range and solidity of Budaëus' services to classical learning are patent in his chief works, which mark

him out as a pioneer in the regions of ancient law, archaeology, lexicography: the *Annotationes in XXIV. Pandectarum libros*, the *De Asse*, the *Commentarii linguae Graecae*, the *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum*. As contrasted with Budaeus, Erasmus always has his eye fixed on the modern bearing of ancient studies—'ea studia sine quibus nec homines sumus,' as he calls them in one of his letters to Budaeus. Any merely esoteric view of classical learning was alien to his very nature. Classical antiquity attracted him not as an antiquarian but as a lover of universal culture; he found in it not an estranging but a unifying power. And his own writing, beautiful in its lucidity and full of point and wit, gave him an advantage often denied to men of greater erudition and more rigorously scientific method.

These qualities of Erasmus help to explain the plan followed by his edition of the New Testament, which forms the centre of interest in the present volume. The principal features of this work are well known: it was the first edition of the Greek Testament to be printed and published, and it contained (a) the Greek text, (β) a revised Latin translation, (γ) Latin notes. The aim thus was to give the New Testament in its original Greek form, and at the same time to make it more intelligible and more accessible. The notes are, it cannot be denied, popular and discursive; they show signs of that 'hurried reading' which Erasmus himself admits. The work as a whole has suffered from the same undue haste: 'Novum Testamentum praecipitatum est verius quam editum,' as Erasmus again acknowledges. In relation to the New Testament, as so often, his admissions must not be pressed too hard against him. We must not forget his earlier attempts to revise the Vulgate version nor the editorial preparations which he had made, during the year 1512 especially, when living in the old tower of Queens' College, Cambridge. But when, in 1516, his edition of the New Testament issued from Froben's printing-house at Basle, he had in hand another equally stupendous task, often mentioned in this volume of letters, that edition of Jerome which followed the New Testa-

ment at an interval of four months only. It was perhaps inevitable that a scholar, however gifted, who worked simultaneously at two such vast undertakings should, in the first issue of the New Testament, have overlooked many misprints or have committed serious errors which need not now be recalled. But when all abatements have been made, much remains. However poor his manuscripts and however faulty the uses he made of them, Erasmus' guiding principle was one of the soundest criticism: to go back to the original Greek text and to exclude passages (such as that of The Three Heavenly Witnesses) which he failed to find in the manuscripts accessible to him. The same fidelity to fact is shown when, in his translation of St. John's Gospel i. 1, he adopts 'In principio erat Sermo' in place of 'In principio erat Verbum'; or again, when in his notes on Acts x. 38, he writes, 'Apostoli Graecitatem suam non e Demosthenis orationibus, sed e vulgi colloquio didicerunt'—a statement strikingly confirmed by the non-literary papyri discovered in our own day. In reference to his own undertaking, Erasmus modestly says, in a letter to John Watson, the Cambridge divine: 'Novum Testamentum tibi, hoc est viro tum integro tum erudito, probari non moleste fero; de quo tamen ipse nihil ausim profiteri nisi nos annixos pro virili ut qualicunque industriola nostra Christi philosophiam bonis mentibus commendaremus' (Allen ii. 429). If, as it was once said by a writer we have lately lost, Greece at the Revival of Letters 'rose from the dead with the New Testament in her hand,' it is surely due to Erasmus as much as any man that Greek learning and the Christian religion were then found to be advancing side by side.

Mr. Allen's own editorial work is, if possible, even more thorough in this volume than in its predecessor, which was described in the *Classical Review* (xxi. 108 ff.) some four years ago. In minute matters of orthography, less exactitude of reproduction might be an advantage. The editor has himself occasionally departed from the original spelling, but he might well have gone further. Little, perhaps, is gained by

printing, often in the same letter and sometimes in the same sentence, forms such as 'haec' . . . 'hec,' 'editum' . . . 'aeditum,' 'Aristotelice' (genit. fem. of the adj.) . . . 'philosophiae,' 'mihi' . . . 'michi,' 'litteris' . . . 'literis,' 'tessera' . . . 'tessara,' ποιῇ . . . λέγει (subjunct.), θεολογικώτατον . . . μουσικώτατον . . . ἀκινδυνώτερον, ἐξηγηματικοῖς . . . ἀπολογητικοῖς. In certain cases some degree of ambiguity follows: e.g., when 'querendum' and 'eque' are given for 'quaerendum' and 'aeque.' On p. 313 there appears to be something amiss with the word Πειθ' in Melanchthon's verses, and on p. 449 a full stop has fallen out after προκαλούμενος. On p. 371 the critical note does not seem clear. Mr. Allen's conjectural emendations are many and good. For example, on p. 39 he omits 'non' before 'perinde,' in a letter from the mannered writer Ulrich Zäsi; perhaps Zäsi had begun the sentence with 'non aliter' in his head. In the postscript to the same letter it might be better not to insert 'scribere' but to supply mentally some words giving the general sense of 'se

tibi . . . salutem.' With regard to Mr. Allen's note on p. 400, l. 368, it may be pointed out that Erasmus (p. 469, l. 2) appears to understand 'anno duodequingagesimo' in the required sense.

It is not often that Mr. Allen has to confess himself at a loss for biographical information: the obscurer a man is, the more he usually has to say about him. But on p. 373 he writes, when dealing with a letter to Erasmus from one Simon Hexapollitanus: 'I am unable to interpret Hexapollitanus; but ll. 22, 26 suggest that the writer had come from some distance and was a German.' I would venture to suggest that this Simon belonged to the Sechsstädte. The six towns included in Lusatia Superior (Oberlausitz) were: Bautzen, Kamenz, Löbau, Zittau, Görlitz, Lauban.

A welcome addition to this second volume is an excellent portrait of Erasmus, reproduced from the diptych painted in 1517 for presentation to Sir Thomas More and now in the Stroganoff Gallery at Rome.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

LE CULEX, POÈME PSEUDO-VIRGILIEN.

Le Culex, poème pseudo-Virgilien. Édition critique et explicative. Par CHARLES PLÉSENT, professeur de première au Lycée Louis le Grand, docteur ès lettres. 8vo. Introduction, pp. 1-60; text, pp. 61-89; notes, pp. 90-264. Paris: Fontemoing et Cie. 1910. 5 fr.

Le Culex, Étude sur l'Alexandrinisme Latin. Par CHARLES PLÉSENT. 8vo. Pp. vi+502. Paris: Fontemoing et Cie. 1910. 10 fr.

THE *Culex*, even when all allowance has been made for the corrupt state of the text, is one of the most commonplace and incompetent of epyllia, and derives its chief interest from the fact that it is attributed to Vergil. M. Plésent has dedicated 502 pages to the discussion of its 414 lines, and has in addition produced a text and commentary which bring the total up to 766! The larger work, though it reveals considerable learning and infinite industry, contributes little that

is new or suggestive, while it is long-winded past all belief. M. Plésent holds that, though Vergil actually wrote a *Culex*, the work was lost or suppressed, and that a forger, with the aid perhaps of fragments of the original poem, composed the work which we now possess. He would date the poem from the latter half of the principate of Augustus, who is addressed in the opening lines of the poem as the young Octavius. That the work is a forgery is possible enough, though the problem of the authorship is, in spite of the confident assertions of scholars on this side and that, extraordinarily difficult, if not actually insoluble. But admitting the possibility of the work being a forgery, it is still incredible that it should have been produced during the lifetime of Augustus. A bad forgery of a lost work by Vergil could not have been dedicated to Vergil's great patron during that patron's lifetime. It would have courted failure and exposure. Further, there is no evidence

in support of M. Plésent's view that the work proceeded from the circle of Pollio, nor, as it seems to us, that it was imitated by Ovid. On the hypothesis of forgery it seems more likely that the *Culex* was produced during the principate of Tiberius or of Claudius, to be accepted by Lucan and Statius, who were less in touch with the atmosphere of the Vergilian age, and might easily have failed to notice the chronological and historical difficulties, which for modern sceptics tell so heavily against the genuineness of the poem.

M. Plésent's researches on the sources and imitations of the *Culex*, on the mythology and 'moral ideas' of the poem, lead to little save the obvious; the whole question of imitations would have been more conveniently handled in tabular form. In a chapter dealing with the 'type and form' of the poem, M. Plésent treats of the general characteristics of Alexandrian literature. He holds that the *Culex* belongs to the 'Peloponnesian type of pastoral.' There is no real evidence to support such a supposition, which, in view of our almost complete ignorance of the 'Peloponnesian type of pastoral,' is somewhat gratuitous.

In his chapters on the language and grammar of the *Culex*, M. Plésent urges that the *Culex* is important for the study of vulgar Latin. That the language of the *Culex* has many peculiarities is undoubted, but the evidence as to the 'vulgar' element in the poem is uncertain to the last degree, and many of the peculiarities would not be found in a less conservative text than that of M. Plésent. The book concludes with an exhaustive chapter on the metre, which may be summarised in the following sentence (p. 487): 'Sans méconnaître ce que le vers du *Culex* doit à la tradition Latine, on peut dire qu'il représente l'accommodation la plus complète possible de cette tradition à l'art savant et au goût subtil des maîtres d'Alexandrie.' This is to give an exaggerated importance to the metre of the *Culex*, and is not substantiated by any real evidence.

M. Plésent's recension has the merit of being the first to be based on the

MSS. (Bembinus, Corsinianus, Vaticanus 2759) which Professor Housman has demonstrated to be the pillars of the text. But M. Plésent has not succeeded in producing a satisfactory text. Apart from two ingenious conjectures, *fetura boum* (21), and *Iovis patrisque* (27), he has made no suggestion that can be of any conceivable assistance to the student of one of the most corrupt legacies of antiquity. Indeed, he has on the whole added to the difficulty of the text rather than lessened it. There are far too many readings which are manifestly impossible: *tendebant hydrae venientis ad omnia visus* (168), *pars inflexis super acta carinis* (346), and *rosa purpureum crescent rubicunda tenorem* (399), seem frankly meaningless, while the retention of readings such as *lurida* (47), *nec fulgor in ulla cognitus utilitate manet* (65), *in rivi praestantis imaginis undam* (57), *placidum rivis sonat orta liquorem* (149), *eversis* (180), *ut procul aspexit luco residere virenti* (109), *sicut Hymen praefata dedit conubia mortis* (247), to mention no others, is only an obstacle to the understanding of the poem. M. Plésent attaches great importance to the retention of the MSS. reading in l. 368, *Flaminius devota dedit qui corpora famae*, holding that it shows the democratic tendencies of the author, Flaminius, 'l'homme de Trasimène,' being a champion of the democracy. The inference is certainly rather a large one to draw from a line, which, if not corrupt, is certainly colourless and clumsy to the verge of fatuity. More instances of a similar kind might easily be quoted, but enough has been said to show the character of the text.

The commentary is clear and learned, where it is not vitiated by M. Plésent's views of the text. It would, however, gain by greater compression. The *apparatus criticus* is perhaps a little overburdened with the readings of inferior MSS., and will cause annoyance to those who object to the alteration of previous systems of abbreviations denoting the various *codices*. But M. Plésent apologises for his audacity, and deprecates in advance the 'raillerie agréable' of Professor Housman.

H. E. BUTLER.

New College, Oxford.

CITIES OF ITALY.

A History of Verona. By A. M. ALLEN. Edited by Edward Armstrong. With 20 illustrations and 3 maps. Methuen.

A History of Perugia. By W. HEYWOOD. Edited by R. L. Douglas. With 21 illustrations. States of Italy: Methuen.

Roman Cities in Italy and Dalmatia. By A. L. FROTHINGHAM. With 61 plates. Murray.

THE two first volumes on our list are part of a new series of local histories. If the others are like them, we shall be fortunate.

Italy is well suited for such a series of histories; there have been so many States, independent yet important, each developing in its own way; and some of them have had an important part in a wider history. How truly each was itself even the traveller can see, who passes from Venice to Verona, from Pisa to Florence. Their characters are shown in their buildings; they are shown no less in the men that were born in them, now in literature, now in art, or again in politics. Verona is especially attractive to us because Juliet lived there; an accident, no doubt, and it was nothing to Shakespeare, but it seems to attract the thoughts of a people that has ceased to care for art. Thus attracted, like Meno's slave they may feel a joy awakening in them at the sight of a Scaliger's tomb, or of the graceful porch of San Zeno. Perhaps the name of Scaliger may awaken a vague echo in the scholar's mind: he will be glad to read how this house showed a princely hospitality to men of genius—like the house of Peisistratus—and how Dante took refuge there; with Bartolomeo, our author holds, not with Cangrande. Unlike Athens, Verona only sheltered men of letters; she had no literary men of her own, although in

Guarino she had a unique person, and one who was the cause of literature in others. Classical students will here find an account of the Amphitheatre.

If Verona is associated with literature and scholarship, Perugia is the place of painting for most of us: but that flower bloomed after Perugia's history was made, the free commune done with. The earlier history of the town could not have been written before; indeed it cannot be fully written now. But the documents of its history are being printed by degrees, and enough has been written on many points to enable this short history to be attempted. It is a summary of research up to the present, and to the English reader the whole will probably be new.

Both books are written in a scholarly manner, with ample footnotes; and the second especially quotes a great many authorities word for word. The pictures are excellent: print and paper good; none of your greasy white lead, but soft light paper that makes us think of the good old days of printing. There are full indices.

The *Roman Cities* is a book that touches more directly upon this Review. It includes both Perugia and Verona, with no less than twenty-five others, and a very large number of pictures. Many of these will be new to most readers—the book is meant for the student rather than the specialist—but if we had the choice, we should ask for more of the new pictures of Roman remains, and fewer of the smaller antiquities that can be found in many books. This will be a useful companion to the traveller, and will direct him to many things that he might otherwise miss; as the remarkable walls of Falerii, the Forum and Capitolium of Assisi, the remains of Ascoli, Asseria, Pola. It is written in an unpretending style, and by a competent authority.

W. H. D. R.

SHORT NOTICES

VAHLEN'S *LONGINUS*.

Διονυσίου ἢ Λογγίνου περὶ ὕψους. De Sublimitate Libellus. In usum scholarum edidit OTTO IAHN A. MDCCCLXVII: quartum edidit A. MDCCCX IOANNES VAHLEN. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri.

THE fourth edition of this well-known book has followed the third at the comparatively short interval of five years. Hence we may infer, as Vahlen suggests in his new Preface, that the study of the Treatise on the Sublime is coming more and more to be regarded as a desirable element in a classical education. There is certainly something uniquely modern, and international, about this ancient essay in literary criticism.

Vahlen's scrupulous care and wise judgment are as conspicuous as ever. He knows and appreciates all the most recent work connected with the subject, while he remains cautious and, in the best sense, conservative. It is five years, and more, since he wrote with reference to his advanced age: 'si quid opis aut utilitatis huic libello, cuius subtili elegantia multi delectantur, attulisse existimabor, non paenitebit, hanc operam hac aetate sumpsisse.' He has now lived to see another edition through the press, and we shall all hope to have still another from the hand of the same unwearied worker. To some famous words of Cicero a slight addition may perhaps be made without untruth: *haec studia senectutem oblectant—et vitam producunt*.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

Theocritus in English Literature. By R. T. KERLIN. Lynchburg, Virginia: Bell and Co.

THIS is a thesis for the doctorate, filling more than 200 pages. To trace classical allusions in English literature seems to be a favourite pursuit in America; we have seen in England the same done

for Shakespeare with instructive results, and Stemplinger's book on Horace has given much pleasure to readers. Mr. Kerlin's book gives a sidelight on Greek culture. He finds Theocritus first mentioned by Skelton in 1523. In the age of Elizabeth the critics all studied him, or gave him first place among the pastoralists. He is alluded to in the *Shepherd's Calendar*, and was the model for Astrophel, as for Lycidas. Several of the Elizabethans were indebted to him; one (nameless) translated six idylls in 1588 (reprinted by Arber, with so many other precious things, for which we must thank that disinterested scholar).

In the seventeenth century the allusions are few; in the eighteenth very many; more than one-third of the book deals with the nineteenth century. The author ends by summarising his results, and gives a bibliography. This book contains materials for other men's deductions, and thus it will always be valuable.

W. H. D. R.

HUMAN LIFE IN LATIN INSCRIPTIONS.

Latin Terms of Endearment and Family Relationship. By S. G. HARROD. Princeton, U.S.A.: Falcon Press.

A Study of the Sepulchral Inscriptions in Bücheler's Carmina Epigraphica Latina. By J. A. TOLMAN. Chicago University Press.

Autobiographic Elements in Latin Inscriptions. By H. H. ARMSTRONG. Macmillan and Co.

THESE three pamphlets are specimens of the special studies which the American University system encourages. There are drawbacks to the system. From the student's standpoint, pedantry is often encouraged; the results are not always worth the trouble, although it is true that the smallest matter thoroughly worked out may throw light on greater

things. These three papers must have cost an enormous labour; but something human emerges from them, and the scholar ought to be grateful.

The first is a study of *C.I.L.* VI.: the crucial words of each text are cited, and the results summed up in tables. It appears that the terms of endearment are not very varied. It is true, 21 are found frequently (15 if we do not distinguish degrees); but out of a total of 6,810, *carissimus* has 1,644, *dulcissimus* 1,568; *pientissimus*, *piissimus*, *optimus*, *sanctissimus*, *incomparabilis* range between 862 and 263. The others of the first list range between 76 and 16; and, besides, there is a considerable number which occur once or rarely. Among these may be noted *abstinentissima*, *audiens*, *domiseda*, and *lanifica* (of one person), *quietissima*, *simplex*, *unimarita*. Different epithets are applied to different ages and relationships. The second part of the essay takes the relationships in order, and gives its epithets with each.

Mr. Tolman studies the form and topics of epitaphs. He shows how the writer will try to avoid commonplace phrases for common topics, and how the bereaved try to console themselves for loss. Fatalism, memories of past honour, pessimism, even frivolity, find expression; and very many hope for life beyond the grave. This collection is important for those who are interested in popular religion.

Mr. Armstrong includes even the fictitious personification where the object is supposed to address the reader, as in the Duenos inscription: this is to extend the idea of autobiography. His essay is rather a study of formulae; for with so wide a conception of the subject, there is not room to give many texts.

W. H. D. R.

Taciti Historiarum Libri. Recognovit
C. D. FISHER. Clarendon Press.

A MODERN editor of the text of the *Histories* owes much of course to the labours of Orelli and Halm and Heraeus and Andresen. Yet in a way his task is also made more complicated by the

number of conjectural emendations which he has necessarily to consider. Where you have only one manuscript, and that a very badly and carelessly written one (the numerous 'deteriores codices' being all derived from the Medicean and, as Mr. Fisher says, 'coniecturis quos vocant humanistarum scaentes'), there is really nothing to do but to emend for yourself or accept the guesses of others: the text must be reconstituted by collation of conjectures rather than of manuscripts; and the chief business of the editor is not to allow liberty to degenerate into licence. 'Medicei auctoritatem,' says the present editor, 'semper pro summa feci, et quidem plurimis locis contra Halmium revocavi.' That is quite right: Halm reconstructed his text primarily 'in usum scholarum,' and therefore sometimes rejected not only what was impossible, but what was merely difficult or not usual. Mr. Fisher has accepted a great many emendations, and made some for himself; but always, or very nearly always, when a reproduction of the manuscript would have been hopelessly unintelligible. Otherwise he is conservative: for example, he keeps the obviously suspect 'inexpertu belli labor' of II. 4, because it is just possible (though indicating his doubt of 'labor'), in preference to any one of the numerous alternatives suggested. But when it is a question of dealing with hopelessly corrupt passages, he has nearly always accepted an emendation, and his selection shows scholarship and good judgment. No text of the *Histories* can always please everybody. The present reviewer cannot believe that it is right to print in III. 84 'morari pacem, domos arasque cruore foedare suprema victis solacia amplectebantur,' as if the infinitives were objects in apposition to 'solacia': this is surely a very harsh construction: the text would be improved by some kind of stop at 'foedare,' making it and the preceding infinitives simply historical. Nor is the editor's explanation of 'forte victi' in III. 18 (as a transposition plus a marginal note) satisfactory: for it involves taking 'forte' in the sense of 'fortasse.' Again in IV. 15 some may regret that Orelli's 'proxima occupatu' (the best and easiest emendation) is not

adopted, or even mentioned. But these small errors—if they are errors—weigh very little in the balance against the soundness of most of Mr. Fisher's conclusions. One is glad to see at last introduced into a standard text such suggestions as 'infesto' for 'justo' in

I. 68, 'servientium' for 'inservientium' in II. 81, 'Daciam' for 'Asiam' in III. 53, and 'Ardæ' for 'Aduæ' in II. 40. The two latter are helpful and probable emendations, the others as certain as conjectures can be.

A. D. GODLEY.

NOTES AND NEWS

DR. MOULTON'S Greek Testament Grammar is to appear in Hirt and Streitberg's *Indogermanische Bibliothek* as *Einleitung in die Sprache des Neuen Testaments*. It has been revised and enlarged. The same author has in the press a small manual on Early Persian Religious Poetry (Cambridge University Press).

The Rev. I. Gregory Smith, LL.D., has deposited with the Editor copies of his pamphlet on the Study of Greek (1904). Any reader of the *Review* may have a copy (as long as they last) by sending a stamped and addressed envelope (9 inches long) to the Editor.

A new departure will be made this summer by the opening of a Summer School in Latin at Bangor, on the model of the holiday courses provided in Modern Languages and other subjects. The programme of the school is based upon the three reforms advocated by the Classical Association—viz., uniform and approximately correct pronunciation, simplified text for beginners, and improved grammatical terminology. The methods of the course will be largely oral, and teachers, whatever their views may be as to the importance of oral teaching, cannot but feel themselves better equipped for their task if they have these methods more at their command, and if they enter into conference together with the aim of making

their work with their pupils more interesting and more effective. The school has been organised by Prof. E. V. Arnold; it opens under the auspices of the Incorporated Associations of Assistant Masters and of Assistant Mistresses in Secondary Schools. The director is Dr. Rouse, who will be assisted by Prof. Granger, Mr. Frank Jones, Mr. W. H. S. Jones, Mr. J. W. E. Pearce, Miss E. Ryle, and others. The opening is at present fixed for August 28, and inquiries should be addressed to Prof. Arnold, Bangor.

Mr. Godley's solution of *Agam.* 69-71 (above, p. 73), has been anticipated by Dr. Farnell in this Journal (vol. xi., p. 293). The Editors beg to offer their apologies for overlooking this. It is, however, a confirmation of the view that two scholars have hit upon it independently.

It may be worth while to record that Greek being voluntary in the High School of Ithaca, N.Y., only a few pupils asked to learn it. The School Board of Ithaca therefore refused to provide instruction. We are so often told that there always will be facilities for teaching Greek if any wish to learn it, that an instance of what actually happens may be useful (see *Classical Weekly*, p. 207).

TRANSLATION

THE LAMENT OF CYCLOPS TO GALATEA.

MERMAID of ocean stream, all white and slender,
Whiter than crudded cream, why so untender?
Playful as any calf, sleek as a berry,
No lamb so soft by half, nor half so merry.
Whene'er I slumber deep, you come and spy me:
But when I wake from sleep, straight you must fly me.
Scared like a sheep you flee that chance the gray wolf see;
What can the reason be Mermaiden flouts me?

Once when you had a mind to gather lilies,
Wishing the place to find where yonder hill is,
I showed you both the way, you and my mother:
I love you since that day, you and no other.
I've not a moment's peace since first I met you;
Nor can my passion cease, nor I forget you.
Yet for all that I swear you feel not any care:
O it is hard to bear! Mermaiden flouts me.

Fair maiden! now I know what is the reason
Why you avoid me so out of all season.
Over my single eye, well fit to scare ye,
One single brow doth lie, all shag and hairy,
Stretching from ear to ear my face to cover:
Flat nose and lips, I fear, please not a lover.
Yes, even such am I: what boots it to deny?

This is the reason why Mermaiden flouts me.
Yet I've a hundred kine on my farm grazing;
Never such milk as mine, worthy all praising!

Never a lack of cheese for every comer,
Bloom spring, or winter freeze, autumn or summer:
Here stand the crates in rows full to o'erflowing.
None of the neighbours knows my skill in blowing
Tunes like as I can play all night and all the day.
Alack and wellaway! Mermaiden flouts me.

At midnight often, too, when I think on ye,
I sing of me and you, O my sweet honey!
I have eleven fawns, markt with a crescent,
All feeding on my lawns, kept for a present;
Four little bears I rear, trying to tame them;
These you shall have, my dear, when you will claim them.
If you but come to me you shall no loser be:
Ah, 'tis no use, I see: Mermaiden flouts me.

Come, let the foaming sea on the rocks beat her!
Here in the cave by me you may sleep sweeter.
Here the dark ivy twines, bays grow in beauty,
Tall cypress trees, and vines most sweet and fruity.
Here from her woody hill Etna sends to me
Snow-water in a rill, drink to renew me.
Could any choose to be down in the rolling sea
Rather than here with me? Yet still she flouts me.

O if my shaggy hair be all that hinders,
Sticks and fierce fire is there under the cinders.
Singe out my life, say I, if 'tis your pleasure,
Or burn my only eye, my chiefest treasure.

O t
Ho
I ha
If
I w
Bun
One
For
Wel
If a
Ther
Dow
Com
How
I
Tend
a
Milk
r
Publis
* * E
Aeschyl
A. Pl
Rich
Alexan
Justi
Wale
bridg
Aristot
Kom
5, 1m
Carl
G. F
Beresfor
Book
and S
Cohen
Métar
xii+6

O that I had been born finny and scaly!
How that mischance I mourn, O willow
waly!

I had swum to your side and kist your
hand with pride,
If you your lips denied: But O she
flouts me!

I would have brought you bright hand-
fuls of posies—

Bunches of snowdrops white, or ruddy
roses;

One at a time, you know, not both
together,

For those in winter grow, these in hot
weather.

Well, I must learn, 'tis clear, to swim
this minute,

If any ship comes here with sailors
in it:

Then I perchance may know what
pleasure 'tis to go

Down in your deeps below, and why
you flout me.

Come, Mermaid, come and stay, wholly
forgetting

How goes the homeward way, like me
here sitting.

Tend with me, an' you please, my flock
and pen it,

Milk kine, and cruddle cheese with bitter
rennet.

Mother's to blame, I see, if my heart's
broken:

Never a word for me once hath she
spoken;

Yet she sees me begin each day to grow
more thin,

If that I cannot win her that so flouts
me.

I'll talk of head and feet throbbing and
aching;

If I'm in pain, 'tis meet she have par-
taking.

Tush, Cyclops, whither away do your
wits wander?

Weave withy-crates, I say, feed the
sheep yonder;

So there is hope that you sense may
recover.

What boots it to pursue a flying lover?
Come, milk the goat to hand! You may
yet find you

A fairer mermaid than she who's behind
you.

Full many wenchies call, bid me stay
near them;

They giggle one and all when I do hear
them.

Clear that on land I've got to count a
little:

Flout me or flout me not, I care no
tittle!

W. H. D. R.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Aeschylus (Agamemnon) Freely translated by
A. Platt. 7" x 4½". Pp. 83. London: Grant
Richards, Ltd., 1911. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

Alexander (G. G.) *The Administration of
Justice in Criminal Matters* (in England and
Wales). 6½" x 5". Pp. viii + 158. Cam-
bridge: University Press, 1911. Cloth, 1s. net.

Aristophanes. Die metrische und rhythmische
Komposition der Komödien. II. Teil.
5, Ἰππῆς; 6, Νεφέλαι; 7, Βάτραχοι. By Prof.
Carl Conrad. 10½" x 7¾". Pp. 40. Leipzig:
G. Fock, 1911.

Beresford (R. A. A.) *The 'Regular' Latin
Book*. 7½" x 5". Pp. 63. London: Blackie
and Son. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

Cahen (R.) *Le Rythme Poétique dans les
Métamorphoses d'Ovide*. 10" x 6½". Pp.
xii + 626. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1910. Fr. 20.

Cahen (R.) *Mensura membrorum rhythmica
cum metrica comparatur. Exempla petuntur
ex Ovidi Metamorphoseon libris*. Paris: P.
Geuthner, 1910. Fr. 4.

Cicero. *Scipio's Dream*. Oxford Plain Texts.
6½" x 4½". Pp. 16. Oxford: Clarendon Press,
1911. Cloth, 4d.

— *Orationes: Pro Tullio, Pro Fonteio, Pro
Sulla, Pro Archia, Pro Plancio, Pro Scauro*.
Edited by A. C. Clark. 7½" x 5". Cloth,
2s. 6d.

— *Orationes: Cum Senatui gratias egit,
Cum populo gratias egit, De Domo Sua, De
Haruspicum Responsis, Pro Sestio, In
Vatinium, De Provinciis Consularibus, Pro
Balbo*. Edited by W. Peterson. 7½" x 5".
Cloth, 3s.

- Costa (G.)** *La Cronologia Romana Preflaviana*. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 252-305. Estratto dalla Rivista di Storia Antica. N.S. Anno xiii. 2-3. Padova, 1910. Tipi della Rivista di Storia Antica.
- Euripides** (Cantica) *Fragmenta Grenfelliano adjecto*. By Otto Schroeder. Teubner's Text. 7" x 5". Pp. vi+196. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 4.
- *Phoenissae*. By J. U. Powell. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 229. London: Constable and Co., 1911. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Gardthausen (V.)** *Griechische Palaeographie*, Band I. Das Buchwesen im Altertum und in Byzantinischen Mittelalter. Mit 38 Figuren. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii+243. Leipzig: Veit and Co., 1911. M. 8.
- Harder (C.)** *Lateinisches Lesebuch für Realanstalten II. Teil. Anmerkungen*. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. 79. Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1911. Paper boards, M. 1.20.
- Hardy (E. G.)** *Six Roman Laws, Translated, with Introduction and Notes*. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. v+176. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Hay (J. S.)** *The Amazing Emperor Helio-gabalus*. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6". Pp. xxviii+308. London: Macmillan and Co., 1911. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Heitland (W. E.)** *A Short History of the Roman Republic*. 8" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 528. Cambridge: University Press, 1911. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Longinus**. *De Sublimitate*. Edited by Otto Jahn. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xxii+94. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 2.80.
- Mendell (C. W.)** *Sentence Connection in Tacitus*. 9" x 6". Pp. viii+158. Oxford: University Press, 1911. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Miller (J.)** *Essentials of the Christian Religion*, pp. vi+286; and *Fundamentals of Unity*, pp. xii+416. 2 vols. of sermons. 8" x 5". London: Elliot Stock, 1911. 3s. net each.
- Nixon (P.)** *A Roman Wit. Epigrams of Martial translated into English*. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. xx+119. Boston, Mass.: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. Cloth, \$ 1 net.
- Ovid**. *Metamorphoses, Book II*. By F. R. G. Duckworth. 7" x 5". Pp. 108. London: Blackie and Son. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Pott (J. A.)** *Greek Love-Songs and Epigrams from the Anthology*. 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. xii+154. With frontispiece. Kegan Paul and Co., 1911. Cloth.
- Prickard (A. O.)** *Plutarch on the Face in the Moon*. Translation, Notes, and Appendix. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 77. Winchester: Warren and Son, 1911. Paper boards, 2s. 6d.
- Rediadis (P.)** *'H ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχία*. By a Greek naval officer. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. 104. Athens: Raptanis Papageorgios, 1911. Dr. 3.
- Renkema (M. G. F.)** *Studia Critica in Scholia ad Aristophanes Aves*. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 96. Traiecti ad Rhenum: Kemink et Fils, 1911.
- Ruppert (J.)** *Quaestiones ad Historiam Dedicatōis Librorum pertinentes*. (Inaugural Lecture.) 9" x 6". Pp. 46. Leipzig: R. N. Bornensis, 1911.
- Sallust (Catiline)** *Simplified Text*. By A. J. Barnett. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4". Pp. 80. London: Methuen and Co., 1911. Cloth, 1s.
- Schroeder (O.)** *Horazens Versmasse, für Anfänger erklärt*. 7" x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 26. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 0.60.
- Scriptorium Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis**. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Sihler (E. G.)** *Annals of Caesar. A Critical Biography, with a Survey of the Sources*. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6". Pp. viii+328. New York: Stechert, 1911. \$ 1.75 = 7s. 6d. Cloth.
- Taylor (A. E.)** *Varia Socratica (First Series)*. St. Andrews University Publications, No. IX. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii+269. Oxford: Parker and Co., 1911. 7s. 6d. net.
- Terence**. *Phormio*. Simplified for the use of Schools, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by H. R. Fairclough and L. T. Richardson. 7" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xvi+118. Illustrations 2. New York: Sanborn, 1911. Cloth.
- The Place-Names of Lancashire: Their Origin and History**. By H. C. Wyld and T. O. Hirst. 9" x 6". Pp. xxiv+400. London: Constable and Co., 1911. Cloth, 26s. net.
- University of Nevada Studies**, III. 1. The Identity of the Child in Virgil's Pollio, by J. E. Church. Sex-propheying among the Ancients: its Basis, by J. E. Church. The Mother in Martial, vi. 3, by J. E. Church and J. C. Watson. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 32. Published by the University of Nevada, 1911.
- Virgil (Aeneid, I.-VI.)**, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by H. R. Fairclough, Ph.D., and S. L. Brown, A.M. 7" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. lxii+516+140. Illustrations 76. New York: Sanborn, 1911. Cloth.
- Wright (F. W.)** *Studies in Menander (Doctor's Dissertations)*. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 110. Baltimore, U.S.A.: the Waverley Press, 1911.